REPORT RESUMES

ED 016 649 TE 000 171

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION. FINAL REPORT.

BY- ALLEN, HAROLD B.
MINNESOTA UNIV., MINNEAPOLIS

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$5.16 127P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CONFERENCE REPORTS, *ENGLISH CURRICULUM, *ENGLISH EDUCATION, *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, *TEACHER CERTIFICATION, COMPOSITION (LITERARY), LANGUAGE, LINGUISTICS, LITERATURE, SPEECH, TEACHING METHODS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BETWEEN JANUARY AND MAY OF 1967, REPRESENTATIVES FROM MINNESOTA COLLEGES MET FOR FIVE CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION. EQCH CONFERENCE DEALT WITH A SPECIFIC AREA OF ENGLISH EDUCATION--SPEECH, COMPOSTITION, THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, AND METHODS. PARTICIPANTS RECOMMENDED EFFECTIVE MEANS OF IMPLEMENTING THE NEW MINNESOTA REGULATIONS ON CERTIFICATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS. THIS FINAL REPORT OF THE CONFERENCES CONTAINS THE ADDRESSES OF THE KEYNOTE SPEAKERS AND OF A SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHER WHO SPOKE ON THE SPECIFIC NEEDS OF THE CLASSROOM, AS WELL AS SUMMARIES OF THE RESULTS OF DISCUSSION GROUPS. AN INTRODUCTION DETAILING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW CERTIFICATION REGULATIONS AND PREPARATION FOR THE CONFERENCES, AND OF THE FORMAT FOR A SIXTH CONFERENCE TO BE HELD FOR THE CONCERNED PUBLIC IS ALSO INCLUDED. AUTHORS AND TITLES OF THE KEYNOTE ADDRESSES ARE--(1) "SPEECH IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM" BY J. JEFFERY AUER, (2) "COMPOSITION IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM" BY WALLACE DOUGLAS, (3) "THE PLACE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDY IN THE CURRICULUM" BY ALBERT MARCKWARDT, (4) "LITERATURE IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM" BY LAWRENCE V. RYAN, AND (5) "THE METHODS COURSE--BY WHOM, TO WHOM, FOR WHAT" BY EDMUND J. FARRELL. (A REVISED VERSION OF THIS REPORT WILL BE PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, FALL 1968.) (DL)

5 2.5

ED016649

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Minneapolis, Minn.

FINAL REPORT

TE000 171

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Minneapolis, Minn.

January - May, 1967

Director: Harold B. Allen

Project Secretary: Shirley Stanley

Advisory Committee: The Advisory Committee on Language Arts
and Humanities for the State Department of Education

FINAL REPORT

Supported by a grant (22-A-FP-025) to the Department of English, University of Minnesota, from the Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Minnesota State Board of Education
Advisory Committee on Language Arts and the Humanities

Chairman
- Harold B. Allen, Professor of English and Linguistics, University of Minnesota

Vice Chairman
- Stanley B. Kegler, Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Minnesota

Higher Education Representatives
- Naomi C. Chase, Professor of Education, University of Minnesota
- Eloise Courter, Division of Language and Literature, St. Cloud State College
- Harold Fitterer, Department of English, Mankato State College
- Clarence Glasrud, Head of the English Department, Moorhead State College
- S. Graham Frear, English Education, St. Olaf College

School Administration Representatives
- Donald Moline, Senior High School Principal, Owatonna
- Agnes McCarthy, Curriculum Director, Faribault High School
- Ernest L. Gustafson, Principal, Northfield Senior High School
- Kermit L. Eastman, Elementary Director, St. Cloud Public Schools
- Albert Flemmer, Principal, Deephaven Elementary School, Excelsior

Classroom Teachers and Specialists
- James Bacon, Librarian, Robbinsdale Public Schools
- Dean Barry, Reading Consultant, St. Louis Park Public Schools
- Edna Downing, Head, English Department, Sanford Junior High School, Minneapolis
- Gloria Erwin, Stillwater High School
- George Janisch, Mechanic Arts High School, St. Paul
- Tracy Tyler, Reading Consultant, Robbinsdale Public Schools
- Bruce Gilbertson, St. Paul Park Senior High School
- Ruth Swanson, 4th Grade Teacher, Oak Park Elementary School, Stillwater

Public Representatives
- Mrs. Fred Paul, St. Paul
- Mrs. Audrey Parish, Robbinsdale

Department Representative
- Gerald L. Kincaid, Language Arts Consultant, State Department of Education

(John McKiernan resigned in May, 1963, because of the pressure of department duties and a television program.)

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION i - v
New regulations vi

THE CONFERENCE ON SPEECH I - 1
Speech in the English Program, J. Jeffery Auer 5
Speech Demands Upon the High School English Teacher, Charles Caruson 9
Summary 20

THE CONFERENCE ON COMPOSITION II - 1
Composition in the English Program, Wallace Douglas 3
Composition in the High School Program, Wallace Kennedy 23
Summary 30

THE CONFERENCE ON THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE III - 1
The Place of English Language Study in the Curriculum, Albert Marckwardt 3
The English Language in the High School Program, Jean Olson 9
Summary 12

THE CONFERENCE ON LITERATURE IV - 1
Literature in the English Program, Lawrence V. Ryan 3
Random Notes from High School Earthiness, Sr. M. André Marthaler 15
Summary 19

THE CONFERENCE ON METHODS V - 1
The Methods Course: By Whom? To Whom? For What? Edmund J. Farrell 3
Summary 13

THE CONFERENCE FOR THE CONCERNED PUBLIC VI - 1
Summary 1

INTRODUCTION

The conferences described in this report are apparently without precedent in American education. They constitute, so far as can be ascertained, the first statewide coming together of concerned representatives of institutions of higher education for the purpose of reaching common understandings with respect to how their institutions can best prepare prospective teachers to meet new and significantly different state regulations for certifying teachers. The conferences are unique also in their being attended by observers from neighboring states that might draw usefully upon such an experience.

Behind the conferences is a recent history of increased concern with the preparation of teachers of English and language arts in Minnesota. In 1961, at the instance of Dr. Gerald Kincaid, recently appointed state language arts consultant, the Minnesota State Board of Education reconstituted its language arts advisory committee. This committee, one of several committees with similar general purposes, has more than a consultative function. Upon the request of the Board it may undertake studies and investigations in the field of its concern and it may initiate recommendations for regulatory measures or other action by the Board. It is composed of representatives of college English departments, English education, high school English departments, elementary classroom teachers, secondary administration, elementary school administration, and the general public.

At its first meeting in 1962 the newly constituted committee found itself charged by the State Board with the responsibility of studying the current regulations for certification in English and the language arts and of proposing any changes therein that subsequently might be considered necessary.

The language arts advisory committee accepted this charge at a time peculiarly appropriate in the history of the teaching of English in the United States. Only the year before the National Council of Teachers of English had published its unique professional self survey, The National Interest and the Teaching of English, which revealed that throughout the country the preparation of teachers of English was shockingly inadequate. More than 94 percent of the colleges preparing them did not require a systematized study of the history and structure of the English language -- and this in a period when no subject except perhaps nuclear physics has undergone such basic changes and experienced such advances as has the field of English linguistics. More than 61 percent of the colleges did not require a course in advanced composition. Only one fifth of them required study of contemporary literature or of literary criticism. The Minnesota situation was like that of the nation as a whole.

Furthermore, on the national level it appeared that only between 40 and 60 percent of the high school teachers of English had actually been prepared to teach English. A check of the situation in Minnesota revealed that it was comparable.

With respect to the legal requirements for certifying secondary school teachers of English Minnesota did not come off with even typical or representative adequacy. For some years the National Council of Teachers of English had received reports from its committee on teacher preparation and certification. Its annual information included data on the hours of credit constituting a major and a minor in the field, the duration of temporary certification, and the like. In 1962 that committee's statement indicated that only twelve states were lower than Minnesota. It was actually possible for a person to teach English in a Minnesota high school with a college background in English consisting of one year of freshman English, a semester course in journalism, a semester course in library method, and one semester course in literature.

Further information came from a study just completed by the advisory committee's vice chairman, Professor Stanley B. Kegler, who had surveyed the relevant offerings in the various departments of English in the state. The actual classroom needs of the teacher in language, composition, and some areas of literature clearly were not being anticipated by these college departments, few of which had offerings in the English language and advanced composition and some of which had serious omissions in the field of literature.

Fortunately, one member of the advisory committee, Professor John McKiernan, chairman of the department of English at the College of St. Thomas, brought with him the fresh experience of having served on a New York state committee that had just completed drawing up the recently adopted new regulations in that state. He now became not only chairman of a subcommittee to work on the needed Minnesota regulations but also chairman of a related committee on standards named by the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English. With some overlapping membership, these two committees cooperated effectively in their task of studying the needs and preparing a proposal to meet the needs.

Another subcommittee provided information to relevant organizations and, once the proposals were prepared, sought their support.

The actual work of arriving at an acceptable proposal required many meetings of the various subcommittees, conferences with related groups including those from the field of speech, junior high school administration, social studies, and college departments of English. It was followed by the normal routine of approval within the State Department of Education after the legally required public hearings. During these several years the originally proposed regulations underwent certain modifications. Ultimately, however, the State Board approved them in the form presented in this report.

But during the year prior to their legal approval by the State Board it became increasingly evident that these regulations would present to most of the twenty-three teacher-preparing institutions a situation for which additional planning was desirable. Most of them did not offer all the courses described as requisite in the new regulations; most of them lacked staff to teach such courses. They had no established machinery for interchange of information and viewpoints among themselves with respect to the work in English, speech, and education.

In deliberating over this problem the language arts advisory committee had been able to arrive at no better feasible approach than the suggestion that concerned personnel from the several colleges arrange to have special sessions at the annual convention of the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English. But at this opportune time the Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory came into existence with its announced function of serving special educational needs in Minnesota and its four neighboring states. Accordingly the committee voted to submit a proposal to the Laboratory for support for a series of conferences that would bring together from the various state colleges the concerned representatives in the fields of speech, composition, English language, literature, and methods.

Because the advisory committee as such could not receive a grant and because the work of administering the proposed conferences would have to be carried on in the office of the committee's chairman, the proposal actually was made by him in the name of his own institution, the University of Minnesota. Although it was, then, to the University that the grant was officially made, members of the advisory committee served as advisers and several, particularly Gloria Erwin and Harold Fitterer, aided in the general planning.

The proposal as first drawn up included a feature not originally considered, that of the sixth conference. It seemed desirable that some avenue of communication to the concerned public be opened, so that key persons interested in education be apprised of new developments in the teaching of English and hence be enabled to interpret subsequent changes to their own groups and the general public. The proposal as approved included a still additional feature suggested by the Laboratory, namely, that since the Laboratory is regional and not only for Minnesota it would be useful to invite observers from the other states. Accordingly, provision was made for inviting such observers. Their participation was made possible through the cooperation of the state departments of education or instruction in these states.

It should be observed that although the proposal did not include further activity with reference to the four other states in the Laboratory area, the observers at each conference clearly recognized the need for action in their own states, particularly in light of the imminent publication of the recommendations of the national study of teacher preparation jointly undertaken by the National Council of Teachers of English, the Modern Language Association, and the National Association of State Departments of Teacher Education and Certification. They recognized that in each state the eight persons to attend these conferences could constitute a working nucleus of a group that might serve to push toward improving the regulations in English and the language arts.

The first five conferences followed a common format. The detailed program of the first conference is included as an indication of the general pattern. Each of these five conferences had a keynote speaker, a national leader in his field, from outside the Upper Midwest. Each conference had a secondary school teacher who addressed himself to the specific needs of the classroom. Then the conference participants engaged in partly structured discussion groups for the rest of the day and the following morning. Reports from the groups were duplicated and distributed prior to the subsequent afternoon, when a general session provided an opportunity for arriving at the chief areas of agreement and disagreement. The substance of this session is included with the report of each conference.

It would obviously be an ex parte judgment for the director of the series to declare that the series accomplished its immediate objectives, although he does believe that it did. Rarely has he been involved in so satisfying and rewarding an activity. This reaction is supported by numerous expressions of opinion from participants and observers, who seem to have found their participation very valuable not only for them but also for their institutions.

But the actual testing of the value of these conferences will occur in several ways.

Will the concerned representatives of speech, English, and English education cooperate as a team in each college for building and constantly improving a good program for prospective teachers of English?

Will the responsible administrators in each college cooperate to retain and obtain the best available competent staff members for such hard-to-staff courses as advanced speech, rhetoric, English language, and English methods?

Will the several colleges continue to share their experiences through the proposed annual special sessions at the convention of the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English?

Will the observers from the other Upper Midwest states be able to draw upon these conferences in moving their own state regulations for certifying teachers of English?

Will the participants in the final conference assume the responsibility of leadership in their respective groups and organizations so that a wide circle of representative citizens is aware of the needs of the schools for better trained teachers in English and for the accompanying curriculum revision that will enable such teachers to work most effectively?

Finally, will this series, though originally concerned with Minnesota and the Upper Midwest, suggest to other states throughout the country that regardless of the excellence of legal regulations there must be some way for the participating institutions to plan and work together in making the regulations honestly effective?

MINNESOTA CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

The new regulations creating the need for the 1967 conference series are as follows:

Minimum Requirements for Preparation of Teachers in Certain Teaching Fields

These requirements shall constitute minimum programs of preparation in the teaching fields to be set up by the colleges. Each prospective teacher shall have at least the amount of preparation indicated in each of the fields. The standard requirements for credits in professional education shall apply except where requirements are specifically mentioned. All new requirements are effective September 1, 1968 unless otherwise specified.

(c) English or Language Arts. The prospective teacher of English or Language Arts shall have:

(1) A teaching major in English or Language Arts of not less than 36 semester (54 quarter) hours to include academic instruction in language, literature, and composition beyond the freshman English requirement in (aa), (bb), and (cc) below, plus academic instruction in speech in each of the two following areas, (1) theory and practice of public address and (2) oral interpretation or play production and direction, in addition to such demonstration of speaking proficiency as the individual institution may normally consider appropriate. This major should include the following areas:

(aa) Expository writing.

(bb) The nature of language, and the historical development and present structure of English language, especially as used in the United States.

(cc) Development of English and American Literature; intensive study of at least one major English or American author; theory and practice of literary criticism; analysis and interpretation of the various literary genres; literature for adolescents; literature of the 20th century and of at least one other century.

OR:

(2) A teaching minor in English or Language Arts of at least 18 semester (27 quarter) hours, including academic instruction in language, literature and composition beyond the freshman English requirement, plus academic instruction in speech as defined in the major in English or Language Arts (c) (1).

The Conference on Speech

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

First Conference: The Speech Component

January 20-21, 1967
Curtis Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

List of Registered Participants

Keynote Speaker

J. Jeffery Auer, Chairman, Department of Speech, Indiana University

Minnesota College Representatives

Augsburg College	Raymond Anderson
Bemidji State College	Joan Reynolds
Bethel College	Calvin Mortenson
Carleton College	John Woodruff
College of St. Benedict	Sr. Colman O'Connell
College of St. Catherine	Miss Mabel M. Frey(Friday) Mrs. Marjorie Kowalsky(Saturday)
College of St. Scholastica	Sr. Timothy
College of St. Teresa	Eileen Whalen
College of St. Thomas	James McCarthy
Concordia College	Carol Torgerson
Gustavus Adolphus College	William Robertz
Hamline University	James Connolly
Macalester College	Roger Mosvick
Mankato State College	Vernon Beckman
Moorhead State College	Delmar Hansen
St. Cloud State College	E. Scott Bryce
St. John's University	James Jaksa
St. Mary's College	James F. O'Neil
St. Olaf College	Theodore Nelson
University of Minnesota	
Duluth	John Ness
Minneapolis	Virginia Fredricks
Morris	Raymond Lammers
Winona State College	Dorothy Magnus

Minnesota High School Representatives

Charles Caruson, Hopkins High School, Hopkins, Minnesota
Richard Fawcett, 317 Folwell Hall, University of Minnesota (leave-of-absence from Richfield High School, 1966-67)

Language Arts Advisory Committee Representatives

Bruce Gilbertson (Friday only), St. Paul Park High School
Harold Fitterer, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota
Gene Piché, University High School, University of Minnesota

State Department of Education Representatives

F. E. Heinemann, Director of the Teacher Personnel Section, Minnesota Department of Education
Gerald L. Kincaid, Consultant in English Language Arts

Observers from Other States

Iowa	John Fonkert, Chairman, Speech Department, Mason City High School, Mason City, Iowa
	Orrin Nearhoof, Director of Teacher Education and Certification, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa
North Dakota	Harold Aleshire, Chairman, English and Speech Department, Minot State College, Minot, N. D.
	David Haney, Vice-President, North Dakota Speech Association, Central High School, Grand Forks, North Dakota
South Dakota	Joseph Farnham, South Dakota State University, Brookings, S. D.
	Janis Shown, Central High School, Aberdeen, S. D.
Wisconsin	Ronald Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
	Earl Grow, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

Final Moderator

Donald K. Smith, Associate Academic Vice President, University of Minnesota

General Recorder

Gene Piché

Discussion Group Leaders	**Discussion Group Recorders**
A - James Connolly	Vernon Beckman
B - Theodore Nelson	Roger Mosvick
C - William Robertz	Carol Torgerson

Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory Representative

John Maxwell

SAMPLE PROGRAM

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

First Conference: The Speech Component
January 20-21, 1967
Curtis Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

FRIDAY

10:45 Discussion leaders and recorders meet with conference director -- Room A

11:30 Registration -- Artist Room

12:00 Luncheon -- Solarium

Conference plan and purpose: Harold B. Allen

Keynote Address: "Speech in the English Program," J. Jeffery Auer, Department of Speech, Indiana University

Response: "Speech Demands on the High School English Teacher," Charles Caruson, Hopkins High School

2:30 Coffee Break

2:45 - 5:15 Discussion Group Meetings

	1: Room A	2: Room B	3: Room C
Leader:	James Connolly	Theodore Nelson	William Robertz
Recorder:	Vernon Beckman	Roger Mosvick	Carol Torgerson
	Virginia Fredricks	John Ness	Joan Reynolds
	Delmar Hansen	E. Scott Bryce	Raymond Lammers
	Dorothy Magnus	Raymond Anderson	Calvin Mortenson
	John Woodruff	Sr. Colman O'Connell	Mabel Frey
	James Jaksa	James F. O'Neil	Sr. Timothy
	Eileen Whalen	James McCarthy	Richard Fawcett
	Bruce Gilbertson	Charles Caruson	Gene Piche
	David Haney	Harold Fitterer	Harold Aleshire
	Ronald Allen	Earl Grow	Janis Shown
	Gerald Kincaid	Joseph Farnham	Orrin Nearhoof
	John Fonkert		

Unassigned "floaters": J. Jeffery Auer; John Maxwell, H. B. Allen

6:30 Dinner -- Solarium

7:45 - 9:15 Discussion Group Meetings (Room assignments as above)

SATURDAY

8:00 Breakfast -- Evergreen Room

"How the State Department of Education Interprets the New Regulations," F. E. Heinemann, Director of the Teacher Personnel Section, Minnesota Department of Education

9:30 Discussion Groups (same room assignments)

10:30 Coffee Break

10:45 Discussion Groups (same room assignments)

12:00 Luncheon -- Evergreen Room

1:30 Final General Session (Rooms ABC)

Reports from leaders or recorders of discussion groups, with synthesis into recorder's summary

Moderator: Donald K. Smith, Associate Academic Vice President, University of Minnesota

Recorder: Gene Piché, University High School, University of Minnesota

3:30 Conference ends.

Speech in the English Program

J. Jeffery Auer

(This summary was supplied by Professor Auer after it became apparent that the typed manuscript of the speech was lost in the mail between Mexico and Minneapolis.)

"The first characteristic of a person who would be educated is that he be literate and articulate," that he be the master of language, our common code. Language is the essential characteristic of human beings, the most revealing of our capacities, aspirations and limitations. The over-riding concern of all teachers of written and oral discourse (English teachers, speech teachers or those of some other name) is with a continuing study of language. It is not for nothing that we refer to "the language arts."

This means that with our students we engage in exploration, revelation and utilization of language. With them we ask such questions as: what is its nature? (i.e., how did it develop? how is it nourished?) how does it function? (i.e., how do we command it? how make it our own?)

Three premises about the nature of language:

1. It is oral in origin. Recent findings in linguistics and the psychology of language emphasize effective oral usage as a prerequisite for good writing. Thanks to technology and the electronic revolution the spoken word has today a predominance it has not enjoyed since Gutenberg. We must recognize language study as both oral and written.

2. While language may be conceived in formal grammar, it lives in common usage. We must understand the concept of levels of usage (of formality, culture, etc.), what the English call different "registers," and that there are problems not only in cross-cultural communication but also among persons in the same social groups. We must, for example, recognize that "good talk" does not necessarily a "good theme" make.

3. Language is essentially culture-bound, both in variety and scope. From a panoramic view language reflects and shapes culture in our literary and rhetorical forms; as culture changes so do these forms. This fact must influence our approach to language, make us incorporate training in critical analysis and critical listening, encourage us to use oral reading and drama as well as direct written and oral discourse. From a microscopic view we also see language reflect and shape culture. We know that the "culturally disadvantaged" child is really the non-linguistic, non-verbal child, and that he is handicapped not only in cross-cultural communication but in communicating within his own culture. Thus we must think of language as always changing, and hence always challenging.

Three premises about the function of language:

1. Language is not merely the "vehicle of thought," but it is the thought. A poorly expressed idea is a poor idea: "the man who says I know just what I mean but can't express it, really doesn't know what he means." We need to make children aware of this involvement of thought and language and provide educational experiences to promote that awareness.

2. Language is essentially a medium for communication. It is more than merely "self-expression," "creative re-interpretation of environment," or "expository writing" (though these may have a proper place in the English program). In everyday terms language is discourse designed to influence -- and with an awareness of consequences -- used in a deliberately manipulated relationship between the speaker or writer, his purpose, his listener or reader, the social context, and what he says. We, and our students, must see and study language in this light.

3. Language is a powerful and dynamic social force. By means of it man interprets, controls, modifies or adapts to his environment: he does this in family, social, business and professional relations. He also does it in decision-making about public issues. We must omit none of these considerations of language functioning in a dynamic social context. We must study the effect of language upon the individual (as in literature and direct oral and written discourse) and also upon society (as in discussion and public persuasion).

Are we talking about speech or English? About speech in the English program? Or about English in the speech program? Really no one of these: we are simply saying that language is the base, the common ground, the critical element in the essential unity of spoken and written communication. And that speech and writing are but different forms, modes, and manifestations of the same central language code.

If all of this is true, how does it relate to the proper training of teachers? How does it relate to "speech in the English program"? Is there a common denominator between what we call English and what we call speech? And can such a denominator undergird the training of teachers? I submit that the concepts and purposes of rhetoric provide the mediating link, the common core. Through an understanding and application of traditional rhetoric in our courses we can, I believe, encompass and implement our three premises each about the nature and function of language.

During this century the discipline of rhetoric has largely been kept alive in college and university departments of speech, but within the past few years we have seen it happily re-emerging in many departments of English, and even in a few English textbooks. You will recognize it when you see it as the modern presentation of the traditional concepts of invention, disposition, style and delivery. Or, as we may more often describe it, finding, organizing, evaluating, phrasing, and articulating information and ideas so as to influence behavior. Unlike the frequent ambiguity of traditional written composition, it is directed to the needs and desires of a specific audience, to real listeners and readers. It is concerned with vital and purposeful communication. And it provides guidelines for our most effective teaching in the total English program.

How can the concepts and purposes of rhetoric strengthen the English program? First, consider some generalizations about speaking and writing considered together as practice in discourse, then some comments about rhetorical components in courses in speech, composition, and literature.

For a sound rhetorical approach to teaching written and oral discourse:

1. Insist upon meaningful subjects that will compel the student to organize and synthesize the learning he acquires in his total educational experience.

2. Set and hold to rigorous standards of invention, requiring speeches and compositions to be fashioned, in a truly intellectual enterprise, out of the student's own synthesis of his learning.

3. Insist that the student write or speak for a specific audience, using the rhetorical disciplines of discourse to give effectiveness to his subject, his ideas, not to himself.

4. Focus not only upon grammar and usage, but upon the dynamic processes of communication: what is said, to whom, under what conditions, and in what frame of reference.

5. Judge all student products as rhetorical discourse, weighing the idea content, scrutinizing the lines of argument and supporting evidence, evaluating the organizational pattern, and assaying the style, and all in terms of what the discourse is expected to do for or to its intended audience.

The English program -- courses in speech: rhetorical components

1. Should include a study of the principles of spoken discourse, critical analysis of selected historical and contemporary speeches, and disciplined practice in speaking.

2. Emphasis upon public speaking, especially expository speeches, but also persuasive ones. The guiding concept should be that of the citizen speaking, and student experiences should include informal discussions, business meetings, panels, and symposiums, as well as solo performances.

The English program -- courses in composition: rhetorical components

1. Should include instruction in grammar, usage, and rhetoric.
2. What is taught about rhetoric should be:
    a. all of rhetoric: invention, disposition, style, and presentation.
    b. applicable to all forms of discourse: description, narration, exposition, argumentation, and persuasion.
    c. in terms of the intended audience.
    d. emphasis upon common elements, but also include a frank recognition of such differences as do exist between good spoken and written discourse, primarily in the matter of types, levels, and functions of style.
    e. reflected not only in discussion of principles, but also in rhetorical criticism of the student's work.

The English program -- courses in literature: rhetorical components

1. The literature studied should represent many genres and a variety of methods of criticism, including rhetorical literature and rhetorical criticism.
2. Literature intended to persuade -- to modify actions, beliefs, or attitudes -- derives from rhetoric and not poetics, and it should therefore be appraised by rhetorical standards. (This literature goes beyond speeches, and includes some didactic essays, plays, novels, and poems.)
3. Rhetorical criticism requires involvement with the dynamics of the communicative act. It includes study of the rhetor's personality and his public character; his immediate audience and the way he adapts to it through choice of topics, nature of proof, and selection of motive appeals; his organization, mode of expression, diction, and sentence movement as means of persuasion; and the effect of the discourse as evidenced by the reactions of the audience and the record of events.

In sum, we need the discipline of rhetoric throughout our total English program, for as Donald Lemen Clark puts it, "without rhetoric, designated by whatever name, liberal education cannot successfully humanize and civilize the young."

Speech Demands Upon the High School English Teacher

Charles Caruson

As I look at this audience, I must confess that I feel a little lonely and a bit anxious about the role that I am expected to perform. But modesty is a tenuous virtue, and only a coward would miss the opportunity to engage college professors in a polemic about a subject in which all teachers of speech and English share pedagogical and substantive interest. From the beginning of this discussion, I confess more humility than temerity, but we compensate for uncertainties; therefore, if my judgments are too reckless or my accusations too brittle and you begin to feel hot flashes, refer to Kenneth Burke's demonic trilogy and recognize that my projection is only a purgative gesture which is ultimately grounded in the need for redemption. If that master critic is correct in his claim that speech serves as a cathartic act, remember that I am only unloading my own guilt, and perhaps in a dramatistic gesture of your own, you also will choose to add to the pile.

But my intention is not to subvert our discipline; like you I have too much at stake. Instead, I think we should seek terms of peace with our English colleagues across the aisle, and, for at least the purpose of this conference, and perhaps our future employment, play their role, identify with their problems and fears, as we all begin to incorporate into our teaching the new "speech demands."

I suspect we all feel just a little more relaxed and pleased since the addition of the new speech requirements in the program of the language arts major. And, I presume we should, particularly if we believe that speech has a significant part to play in man's total language development. But before our heads are cocked in postrues of too much assurance and our hubris begins to show, I think some questions and charges are in order. Or, as John Keltner recently asked, "Do we know what we are about and why?"[1] If you have read from the extensive bibliography that Professors Allen and Piche prepared, you are probably like me, a bit hesitant to invoke the declarative mode. Even so, I will hazard at least a tentative commitment. I think there are at least three parts to our problem: (1) A need to examine briefly the philosophic premises upon which speech and the English curriculum should rest, or what Professor Donald K. Smith has termed the sub-structure of knowledge; (2) the recognitions that while each discipline has a unique part to play in language instruction, emphasis upon the commonality of our disciplines should be stressed rather than our differences; and (3) the problem of teaching effectively what has been structured legally will depend largely upon our understanding the myriad problems that face the classroom teacher as he begins to translate these newer and broader language arts aims.

What possible significance does an understanding of the sub-structure of knowledge have upon an English curriculum that speech is going to share?

I suggest that it serves as the necessary philosophic grounding for a general theory of language that Professor Smith so poignantly analyzed in the Speech Teacher symposium.[2] You will remember that the writer prefacing his conceptual scheme translated "speech" into "language."

> Let me suggest five concepts about speech, or about language if you will, each of which provides a fundamental perspective in the nature of speech or language and each of which is knowable and needs to be known by any person seeking rational management of himself as a speaker and listener."[3]

Perhaps I press Professor Smith too far, but after reading his essay, "English, Speech, and Language Arts: Disorder and Latter Day Sorrow,"[4] I believe that he would tolerate the translation. And I will make another assumption and presumptuously treat it as admitted matter. No one here would disagree with Professor Gleason's claim

> that language must be the integrating center about which a new English curriculum is to be built. It must be that center for several reasons: First, language underlies both composition and literature and is the only fundamental point of contact between the two. Second, it is with language that school education begins, and it is out of the reading and writing instruction of the elementary grades that the English program of higher education must come. Third, language is one of the most important characteristics of human existence, and it most emphatically deserves close and scholarly study. Fourth, it is here in the close study of language that the English curriculum can best advance the integration of the humanities and the sciences.[5]

Time hardly permits any orderly or critical discussion of these diverse elements that Professors Smith and Gleason introduce, but one thing is certain, in each perspective "rhetoric," at least implicitly, becomes a pivotal term, since it serves as part of the nexus between language as described and language as addressed. Unfortunately, even by investing the term "rhetoric" with curricular importance, we hardly dispel the mystique and ambiguity that is attached to the term. But why am I concerned with terminology? Allow me to tell you a story. Not too long ago in one of our local schools, members of an English department were discussing the problem of rhetoric. Before the discussion was concluded, the term had been linked not only to ornamentation, but used synonymously with "speech." How was the confusion eliminated? Simple. One member of the department was elected to call the English department of the university to discover the meaning of"rhetoric," and another chosen to call the speech department to find out the meaning of "speech." At one time in my academic career, I would have cast a smug smile and proceeded with at least a simplistic, albeit impatient, definition. Perhaps, unlike me, you are able to avoid the simplistic and are able to cast each term into an understandable context for those English teachers. But if you feel a little hesitant, even doubtful, allow me to share your confusion while I simultaneously remind you that we are now asking questions about a more specific phase of our language philosophy.[6]

Insofar as students learn the forms, attitudes, and skills as they induce actions in each other, does it really matter if we call our function "speech" or "rhetoric?" ("Public address" is hiding somewhere in the background.) After all Richards tells us that the meanings of terms are determined by their inter-inanimation; if the context is disturbing, learn to tolerate the ambiguity. I suggest that we have tolerated their ambiguity too long, and that the intentions or meanings of "speech" and "rhetoric" have direct and important implications as they are translated into pedagogical theories and practices. If rhetoric is to be the means by which we attack problems of persuasion including the ability of a speaker or writer to effectively achieve what "his purpose calls for,"[7] or if it includes the study of its varying forms,[8] or if it is interpreted as "the rationale of discourse,"[9] then consideration should be given to its boundaries. And what about speech? It probably is suffering even more from dimensional ambiguity. Is speech rhetoric, beyond the vocal dimension? What is the relationship between the two terms? Does rhetoric belong within the corpus speech as another equal part of the total curriculum that includes discussion, debate, semantics, psychology of speech, interpretative theory, public address, etc? If it does have an equal role, then perhaps it might first be desirable to define this relationship. Or, on the other hand, is rhetoric once again become a transcendental term in the tradition of Edward T. Channing who in the nineteenth century defined rhetoric as

> a body of rules derived from experience and observation, extending to all communication by language and designed to make it efficient. It does not ask whether a man is to be a speaker or writer, a poet, philosopher, or debater; but simply, is it his wish to be put in the right way of communicating his mind with power to others, by words spoken or written....[10]

In 1955 addressing a symposium entitled: "What is Speech?" Professor Wayland Parrish stated that the "core of our discipline lies in the topics of voice, articulation, tempo, emphasis, pause, reflection which are the constant elements in all our speech activities."[11] Andrew Weaver, addressing the same seminar, noted that the proliferation of the speech curriculum offering which includes--

> (1) Informal speech; (2) Rhetoric and public speaking; (3) Interpretative speech; (4) Drama and theatre; (5) Speech pathology and audiology; (6) Voice training and science; (7) The psychology of speech; (8) Speech Education, and (9) Information theory--[12]

is a desirable growth. He emphasized the broad function of speech but assigned rhetoric and public speaking to one of the nine parts of the speech curriculum. A. Craig Baird, on the other hand, confessed that he has "given his private allegiance to the art of communication or rhetoric,"[13] and asked, "What is the function of speech as rhetoric?"[14]

That function for Baird is linked to the goals of Aristotelian rhetoric which is "still central in speech teaching today; communication is for the preservation and progress of a free society and for a good society."[15] Thus Baird abstracts rhetoric from the catalog of offerings and would make it the focus of the speech course. While these abstractions are woefully incomplete, they suggest part of the problem of definition and scope.

And now the other presumptuous question: what about rhetoric? What is it and where does it fit into a philosophy of language? The responses to this term are as varied as they were to speech. Otis Walter rejects the consideration that rhetoric

> should be concerned only with persuasion. Looking at rhetoric through the glass of persuasion may often give a strangely distorted view of things, and often an unintelligent view.[16]

He wonders about implications for rhetoric from "the various doctrines of phenomenology, of the analytic school, or of existentialism."[17] Like Weaver, who had incorporated various disciplines into the genus speech, Walter also wants to borrow from the "scholarly banks" of sociology and anthropology, philosophy, and history. In his concluding statement he wants rhetoric to

> be a humanistic study . . . concerned with the nature and problems of man. Since mankind has desperate need of a new rhetorical theory and practice that will lead to sanity, to creativity, to wisdom, to freedom, and to fulfillment.[18]

Perhaps my bias strains his intentions, but if the term "speech" were substituted for "rhetoric" we would be remarkably close to the context of Weaver. Note that a similar broad meaning is given to the term by Marie Hochmuth Nichols:

> I take rhetoric to mean the theory and the practice of the verbal mode of presenting judgment and choice, knowledge and feeling. As persuasion, it works in the area of the contingent, where alternatives are possible. In poetics, it is the art of imaginative appeal; in scientific discourse, it is the means of so presenting truth as to fix it clearly in the mind of the listener or reader.[19]

Professor Hochmuth's definition is inclusive enough to incorporate practically all levels of language behavior that involve speaker-audience relationships. Finally, and it was inevitable, we move to Burke's definition which is the most encompassing since it sees the "rhetorical motive" lurking in every meaning however purely scientific its pretensions. "Whenever there is persuasion there is rhetoric. And whenever there is meaning, there is persuasion."[20] For Burke all speech forms can be dropped into a rhetorical basket.

While these selective definitions from both speech and rhetoric overlap, the confusion is hardly terminated. Without making any studied quantification, I noted that the Speech Teacher includes more articles with "speech" in the title than does the Quarterly Journal which, while it includes articles of similar substantive material, uses the term "rhetoric." One wonders if we are not guilty of creating an unconscious hierarchical design as we place these terms in our professional journals.

Once again the refrain: why worry about distinctions? Apply the terms to any context that we wish and go about our business. But that is not enough. Most of us have grown weary of the speech potpourri. Just as we are tired of the texts that take us through a little bit of voice drill (with the hand on the diaphragm), a reading of Henry's plea for a horse (to improve voice quality), a brief history of great Greek and Roman orators (to make one appreciate the heritage), an analysis of five different kinds of speech, including the distinction between convincing and persuading, radio and television speaking, parliamentary procedure, gesture, introducing one another, the sales talk and a chapter or two on how to organize the speech. If you think I exaggerate, take time to examine the high school speech texts that are currently in use, and you will join me at the weeping wall. Instead of this parochial emphasis, I want new teachers to understand the best of our tradition. If we want rhetoric to be a "god-term," then there needs to be incorporated a new rhetorical emphasis that concedes the urgency of understanding interpersonal relationships or what Professor Smith has termed the "fragile nature of inter-personal meaning as well as the most formally structured occasions where speakers and audiences attempt to share meanings." Personally I find it difficult to ignore the hopes of Otis Walter or Robert Scott[21] or the directions of Kenneth Burke. None of their theoretical explorations express any Pollyannic hope of cleaning up the "human barnyard." Rather they are closer to being tragic theories of rhetoric, because they accept the imperfections of man, just as they attempt to push him forward stumbling towards moral perfection. They celebrate freedom, but simultaneously recognize man's communicative limitations.

But I have spent enough time abstracting. The point is clear. I think the classroom teacher has a right to expect you to do some careful reflecting, sifting, and constructing in order to determine the scope and meaning of these two pivotal terms, "speech" and "rhetoric," lest we all end, like Gorgias, as Plato's whipping boy. Earlier I mentioned that the understanding of the sub-structure of knowledge was one of the guarantees that might alter our emphasis upon activity as an end to speech behavior. I am tired and embarrassed of observing speech and English teachers in the secondary school translate their own particular level of expertise, whether it be oral interpretation (because she loves the theatre) or debate and oratory (look at the trophies on the mantle). As if the miracle of performance was the divining charge, the way out of the language wilderness. Every year I hear about teachers playing out stories or when there is real desperation they go to charades.) Now I do not believe we are opposed to activity (performance) when it is linked to broad instructional goals; (see Gilbert Ryle's distinction between knowing how and knowing that[22]) but I believe we all agree that continual reliance upon performance, including public address and interpretation, predicated on nothing more than teacher talent, interest, and intuition is hardly a way to maintain our place in the curriculum. And I oppose even more vehemently telling our language arts colleagues to move over and give us a share of their curriculum because we know how to translate that deadened atmosphere of the English classroom. Let speech ring out; we can show you the way! Get 'em on their feet, more speeches, more discussion, more of the stuff that builds confidence and the easy smile. And all of this with hardly a backward glance at the denominators of language philosophy or even a look at the assumptions that we are in fact altering language behavior. Is it any wonder that the Pooleys of another generation tell us that the English teacher must be concerned with

> the development of an acceptable speech dialect, command of contemporary idiom, participation in the discussion of cogent ideas, the presentation of conflicting ideas and opinions, the development of sensitivities to literary qualities, particularly those of oral interpretation and the enjoyment of literature by sound.[23]

To speech the Professor allocates, "the development of significant skills and techniques." In that Speech Teacher symposium one of the country's most distinguished English educators sees the purpose of the speech course "to advance the skills of voice, enunciation, pronunciation, bodily movement, gestures, pantomime, panel discussion and the conduct of public meetings . . . ."[24] And if we do not feel inferior enough, he administers the final coup de grace quickly and cleanly: "The purpose of a speech course is to advance those skills to the point of an art, that is to the highest pitch of performance."[25] And how do you like this gem taken from the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals: "The importance of speech in everyday life is being recognized more and more by school administrators and the public. One's personal feeling of success and failure depends greatly upon the ability to present his ideas clearly." And how will these miracles be accomplished? Simple. Get 'em on their feet.

Perhaps we do suffer from "hierarchic psychosis and desire to move upward, but I do not think that we want to be the English teacher's vehicle. In the role of a speech teacher who has already crossed the aisle, I am perfectly willing to be complementary and I certainly want to be friends. I gave up fighting long ago--his number, his arguments, and his money dissipated my strength. Even so, my self respect is wanting, and, as I face my class as a speech teacher teaching English, (most of us do) or as an English teacher teaching "oral language," I want to be armed with more than a list of activities. I want the Professor Pooley's to translate that term "complementary" to commonality, and I want to be known as more than a hack performer, even if I did come out of vaudeville.

The idea of commonality leads me to the second emphasis. If the similarities of our respective disciplines are acknowledged, then the integration of the recommended courses will proceed as a logical and even desirable phase of the language arts program. As I mentioned earlier, we are believers in what the Smiths, Gleasons, Keglers, and Squires have called the language centered curriculum (regardless of how limited our understanding). In fact it is safe to say that we owe this conference largely to the leadership of Professor Allen, who I am proud to say, is a former debate coach, a rhetorician as well as a professor of an austere discipline. I doubt very much that we would be talking about even a modest integration of speech and English if the various committees that effected this change had emphasized speech as activity instead of speech as part of total language behavior. It is not too difficult to find that common perspective. Briefly it recognizes the study of "language as the intellectual center of our field."[26] It calls for "an understanding of language, the manipulation of language, and the appreciation of language."[27] It seeks the ethical-moral antecedents of rhetoric as emphasized by Professor Otis Walter. It views "almost all verbal acts as having grammatical, rhetorical, poetic, and ethical dimensions."[28] It gives support "not . . . [in] the area of the so-called skills. Rather . . . in the discovery by the youth of the things that are worth communicating about."[29]

These rather terse abstractions whether they call attention to language as a basis for understanding behavior, or to the ethical-moral precepts of rhetoric, or to the function of "rhetoric as effectiveness not the correctness, of a speaker's or writer's utterance,"[30] are strong reminders of our common interest, just as they are implicit suggestions of the need to understand the scholarly emphasis that is occurring in both of our disciplines as meaningful integration takes place.

While I have mentioned the similarities of our disciplines, the genus, I am turning away from the differentiae for two reasons: First, as speech teachers we are already aware of what Professor Gleason referred to as "the differences in many details"[31] between oral and written language. Indeed, his essay that deals with language variation presents an interesting concept for language arts teachers as they compare and contrast the written and spoken forms of language.

The second reason perhaps leaves me vulnerable, and I sense a kind of dilemma. The more we emphasize our unique contribution (somehow, at least at the secondary level, that contribution becomes translated as performance) and call attention to our differences, the more we are liable to frighten away those with whom we must work. Once again, I want to convince the non-performer that successful speech teaching does not depend on the ability to win a talent contest.

While the philosophic groundings that I have attempted to establish are at best cursory, perhaps they point the way to your own pedagogical frustration as you begin to translate these designs into your respective curriculums. The task appears overwhelming for you and the beginning teacher. Forget your own problems for a moment, and project yourselves into the role of a beginning teacher of the language arts. He has taken at least fifty-four quarter hours of work including those six hours of speech. As he begins his first teaching position, he will be fortunate if his school has a syllabus that lists the literature that is available; or he may even have a look at a Project English unit, although that is doubtful. What he will have, besides excessive anxiety, is the memory and notes of those fifty-four hours. Now all he has to do, with little outside guidance, is translate your theory into a conceptual scheme that has sequence, relevance, and coherence. The charges are easily made, "Do the task that you were educated to do!" But the implementation is fraught with perplexing problems. If he is like most teachers, he has a bias. He never enjoyed reading orally, but loves to explicate. "But there was mention of some kind of curriculum metamorphosis--I'll forget about the listening, that effect cannot be proved anyway. They've got to write. And, oh yes, the speech; where shall I place that? Perhaps after the short story unit; they could even talk about their favorite character. . ."

I interrupt the stream of anxiety here, but first, let me assure you that what I have described is not unique. Should we have hope that there will be some scenic and role alterations? I think we can hazard at least a cautious affirmative, particularly if proper emphasis has been given to the integration of speech and English based upon those language charges and precepts to which I have already referred. But a note of warning. If the speech phase has been treated as an isolated act or as an ancillary activity which is cursory, fragmentary, and ill-planned, then we are doomed to repeat the history of separate but dying ways.

Unfortunately, under the best of conditions competition for the hour or the module, will not easily fade. Literature continues to proliferate, and the demands upon writing grow still more intense. Where shall speech be placed; when do students have time to develop oral appreciation? Answers to these difficult questions ultimately depend upon your conception of the philosophy, content, and sequence of the total language arts or English program. I therefore urge you to become familiar with the units of the Project Center, with the various studies published by the National Council of Teachers of English, as well as its collection edited by Dean Kegler dealing with the Changing Role of English Education, with The Review of Educational Research, Volume XXXIV, entitled Language Arts and Fine Arts, and with countless other journals, all essential sources which provide part of the rationale for our changing curriculum. Perhaps I am being presumptuous, but it appears to me that any credible integration of speech and English, hinges upon our taking a rigorous interest in the English curriculum.

Finally, if we believe in the tenets that have been prescribed by Professors Smith, Allen, and Kegler (I've got to plug the home team) or in what Jeffrey Auer, James Squire, or H. A. Gleason have been advocating, then that beginning teacher, and all of us, can begin to move towards an English or language arts curriculum that has dimensions of reality. We may not win as many beauty contests, but perhaps we will be a few steps closer in helping to clean up the "human barnyard."

Notes

[1] John Keltner, "Speech for all American Youth: Current Needs, Issues, and Problems," *Speech Teacher*, XV (January, 1966), 13.

[2] Donald K. Smith, "Speech for Tomorrow: Concepts and Context," *Speech Teacher*, XV (January, 1966), 11-33.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[4] *The Changing Role of English Education*, ed. Stanley B. Kegler (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965), 61-70.

[5] H. A. Gleason, "What is English?" *College Composition and Communication*, XIII (October, 1962), 6-7.

[6] See the January, 1967 *Speech Teacher*, pp. 1-10, in which Loren Reid attempts a distinction between the two terms. While I am grateful for his discussion in which "rhetoric" is subsumed under the more general rubric "speech," the confusion that we have outlined is hardly dispelled.

[7] Martin Steinmann, Jr., "A New Rhetoric," a paper given at the summer meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, July 30, 1965, Ann Arbor, Michigan, p. 2.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Loren Reid, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[10] In Ronald F. Reid, "The Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory, 1806-1904: A Case Study in Changing Concepts of Rhetoric and Pedagogy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLV (October, 1959), 246.

[11] "What is Speech? A Symposium," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLI (April, 1955), 145-153.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 152.

[16] "On Views of Rhetoric, Whether Conservative or Progressive," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIX (December, 1963), 375.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid., p. 382.

[19] Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), pp. 7-8.

[20] Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955), p. 172.

[21] See Robert L. Scott, "Some Implications of Existentialism for Rhetoric," Central States Speech Journal, XV (November, 1964), 267-678, and "On Viewing Rhetoric as Epistemic," Ibid., XVIII (February, 1967), 9-17.

[22] Martin Steinmann, Jr., op. cit., p. 2, or Donald K. Smith, op. cit., p. 31.

[23] Robert C. Pooley, "Oral Communication in the English Curriculum," Speech Teacher, XV (January, 1966), 27-28.

[24] Ibid., p. 28.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Donald K. Smith, "English, Speech, and Language Arts: Disorder and Latter Day Sorrow," The Changing Role of English Education, ed. Stanley B. Kegler (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965), p. 61.

[27] Gleason, op. cit., p. 7.

[28] William H. Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1963), p. 158.

[29] John J. DeBoer, "The Relation Between Speech and English in the Curriculum of the Secondary School," Speech Teacher, XI (March, 1962), 102.

[30] Steinmann, op. cit., p. 2.

[31] Gleason, op. cit., p. 7.

[32] See no. 4 above.

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Summary of First Conference: The Speech Component

Individual Group Discussions. The individual discussions of January 20-21 appear to have achieved a consensus on the following propositions regarding the speech component of the newly adopted state certification requirements for secondary school teachers of English.

1. The definition of public address ought to be broad enough to subsume the varied contexts and situations in which citizens communicate.
2. The work in public address ought to proceed from a concern with underlying theory of the purpose and function of public, oral discourse; it should not simply stress performance.
3. The work in public address should acquaint students with the peculiar rhetorical emphases found in the four canons of classical rhetoric: invention, arrangement, and style, as well as delivery.
4. There should be some attempt to provide introduction to broader interpretations of rhetorical process as implied in the "new rhetoric."
5. The contributions of sociology, psychology, anthropology in developing theory of modes and functions of oral discourse should be included and emphasized.
6. The work in public address should contribute to the development of a general critical theory for the evaluation of instrumental language acts.
7. The work in oral interpretation, stressing both practice and theory, should contribute to the prospective teacher's overall effectiveness in bringing understanding and enjoyment of literature to high school students.

Final General Session. The final general session defined areas of broad agreement achieved in the individual group discussions and pointed up unresolved questions regarding implementation of the new requirements. This final session was introduced by a discussion of a series of questions emerging from the Conference.

1. What are "fundamentals"? Can we encourage the adoption of speech proficiency tests and waive the "fundamentals" requirement?
2. What do we mean by the "new rhetoric"?
3. What are the boundaries of our definition of "public address"?

Are we willing to accept a concept broad enough to include all situations involved in a theory of communicating citizens?

4. What is the real purpose of courses in oral interpretation?

5. What responsibility are we willing to accept for the development of instruction in the appreciation and criticism of the mass media and popular arts?

6. Are we sufficiently concerned with the consumers of oral discourse?

7. Are we adequately concerned with problems of responsible as well as effective and free speech?

8. How do we indicate our understanding that rhetoric is the rationale of both written and oral discourse?

Areas of Broad Agreement

1. The major concern of Conference discussion was with the development of programs of college instruction in speech which would be both useful and important in the preparation of teachers of English in secondary schools. The discussions did not deal with problems involved in the preparation of teachers of elective courses in speech or directors of secondary school speech activities programs, although there may be areas of overlapping concern.

2. A precise definition of course content was not achieved. Although such a definition was not an objective of conference discussions, concern was expressed that the general discussions should encourage reexamination of curricula leading to the development of improved course content. The following general emphases were endorsed as possible sources or directions to be taken in improving course content:

    a. Traditional rhetorical theory

    b. Contributions of contemporary studies in the social sciences

    c. Emphasis on content which distributes attention between the consumer and producer of discourse.

    d. Emphasis on development of content regarding study of human communication which transcends the limits of traditional public speaking forms

    e. Development of content which emphasizes the responsibilities of the citizen communicator as a critical evaluator of discourse

f. Although discussion resulted in no program for its achievement, there was endorsement of the significance of Professor Auer's question directing attention to the desirability of developing critical and appreciative study of the mass media and popular arts.

Some Unresolved Questions

1. While there seems to be little difficulty in securing agreement on the desirability of including work in oral interpretation, questions regarding the nature of the usual course in "play production" raised issues regarding its applicability for teachers of English.

    a. Courses which are essentially practical and production-oriented may not provide sufficiently broad, humanistic study of the theatre.

    b. Neither courses in "dramatic literature" limited to textual study nor courses in "play production" are presently adequate. Discussion emphasized the desirability of developing new courses providing broader and at once more liberal study of the theatre.

Gene Piché, General Recorder

The Conference on Composition

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Second Conference: Advanced Composition

February 17-18, 1967

Curtis Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

List of Registered Participants

Keynote Speaker

Wallace Douglas, Department of English, Northwestern University

Minnesota College Representatives

Augsburg College	Joanne Karvonen
Bemidji State College	Ruth Stenerson
Bethel College	Jeannine Bohlmeyer
Carleton College	Harriet W. Sheridan
College of St. Benedict	Sr. Linnea Welter
College of St. Catherine	Sr. Mary Virginia
College of St. Scholastica	Sr. Sarah Smedson
College of St. Teresa	Norbert Geier
College of St. Thomas	George Toman
Concordia College	Jeanine Moravec
Gustavus Adolphus College	David Harrington
Hamline University	Quay Grigg
Macalester College	Howard Huelster
Mankato State College	Loren Maakestad
Moorhead State College	Verle D. Flood
St. Cloud State College	Paul Cairns
St. John's University	Herbert Burke
St. Mary's College	Walter C. Ayotte
St. Olaf College	George Miller
University of Minnesota	
Duluth	Harry J. Davis
Minneapolis	Ned Edgington
Morris	Dorothy Barber
Winona State College	Augusta Nelson

Minnesota High School Representatives

Hubert A. Anderson, Hopkins Senior High School, Hopkins, Minnesota
Bruce Aunan, Central High School, Duluth, Minnesota
Wallace Kennedy, Bloomington (Minnesota) Schools, Coordinator of English

Language Arts Advisory Committee Representatives

Ernest L. Gustafson, Principal, Northfield Senior High School, Northfield, Minnesota
George Janisch, Mechanic Arts High School, St. Paul, Minnesota

State Department of Education Representatives

F. E. Heinemann, Director of the Teacher Personnel Section, Minnesota Department of Education
Gerald L. Kincaid, Consultant in English Language Arts

Observers from Other States

Iowa	Marjorie Fink, Iowa State College, Cedar Falls, Iowa
	Will Jumper, English and Speech Department, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa
North Dakota	Robert E. Johnson, College of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. D.
South Dakota	Leslie E. Boyd, Department of Languages and Social Sciences, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Rapid City, S. D.
	Bernese Knudson, Central High School, Aberdeen, S. D.
Wisconsin	Jarvis Bush, Department of English, Oshkosh State University, Oshkosh, Wisconsin
	Ernest Heiman, Monona Grove High School, Madison, Wisconsin

Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory Representatives

Ronald Brandt
John Maxwell

Final Moderator

Rodger Kemp, Chairman, Department of English, University High School

General Recorder

Ned Edgington

Discussion Group Leaders	Discussion Group Recorders
A - Harriet W. Sheridan	Walter Ayotte
B - Paul Cairns	Jeannine Boylmeyer
C - David Harrington	Ruth Stenerson

COMPOSITION IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM

Wallace Douglas

When I last saw Professor Allen, we were in Chicago, coping with the January blizzard and what I am afraid may not be the penultimate general discussion of the Guidelines for preparing English teachers that have emerged from the lucubrations of the English Teacher Preparation Study.[1] My mind, as you can imagine, was on other things than what I was going to be saying in Minneapolis three weeks later. Abstracted as I was, I told Mr. Allen that I would make it. Promises are easy, two weeks is a long time to a writer. And so I turned back to the discussion of how the guidelines could encourage the discovery of teachers with a sense of humor who would also have some quality--I forget just which one--that Thoreau approved.

Now the fact is that I knew three points that I wanted to make, but I didn't have the remotest idea of how I was going to "make" them. (The second make is in quotes; I wonder if my voice caught them. The quotes are a shorthand way of saying that the first make [make$_1$]means simply something like "state" or "say," whereas make$_2$ means "put into form" or "choose a form for." I trust you will forgive me if I do not go into the meanings of mean, as I have used it there. But please do remember the distinction between the two make's. I shall have to return to it.) Mr. Allen's question gave me, as we say, to think, though perhaps not furiously. And for ten days or so I have been fitfully wondering how to do it--wondering, not planning, I remind you--how to say what I have to say in a manner that will be attractive as well as clear. As a matter of fact, for a good share of that time I have been wondering about nothing more complicated than how to begin.

As another matter of fact, it was not until last night that I got the right idea, the one that carried with it some feeling of rightness. "Last night" was Monday, February 6th; and no doubt one's critical stance weakens as one's deadline gets closer. I got the idea as I was reading around in various of our trade journals, in search of materials, ideas, and I suppose one might say inspiration. In the January issue of English Journal I came upon an article called "Showing the Average Student How to Write--Again" (LVI [1967], 118-20). It is rather a good article (though perhaps not for the reasons the author and editor thought); and I think you should read it. What caught my attention, however, was not the "thesis" or "argument" of the article as a whole, but rather a passing remark by the author in which she indicated what she expected in papers, or as she put it, would "request of my pupils": "strong, predictive introductions, organized content, cogent and graphic illustrations." And as I read that, I said to myself, "Well, why not a predictive introduction? Maybe not 'a strong, predictive introduction,' for perfection is not often given to mortal man. But surely at least one that is predictive."

So. I am going to discuss three objectives for advanced composition courses that will, as it seems to me, provide "prospective teachers with what will enable them, in turn, to deal with composition in the high school." Such are my terms of reference from Professor Allen: to tell you "What content, what approach, what actual writing will best do the job?" My first topic will be the attitude that I think must imbue the goings-on in such a course, and that its students should take away from it. Second I want to say a few things about rhetoric and its place in the preparation of composition teachers. And finally I want to discuss what I have just, in a way, been illustrating: that is, the process of writing, in which, it seems to me, the content of this course must be found.

If you think back over your own experience in composition classes--not your own, those you have sat in as students--I suspect you will agree that most American teachers of composition have an obsessive concern for practical objectives. The following remarks express the central attitude in the textbook tradition and also, I am sorry to say, in the teaching tradition too.

> It is indeed trite to suggest that acceptable usage should be a prerequisite for effective communication . . . .
> Seeing, of course, involves first of all reading, and reading that is efficient and comprehensive.
> In any event, the non-transfer [from junior college] student must discover that if he is to prepare himself to meet the competitive demands in the business world, he must use his language adequately and profitably; he must be able to communicate effectively without objectionable solecisms . . . .[2]

Indeed so wide-spread, so general, so unquestioned is this assumption that a writer who has concluded "that composition, written or oral, is a weak sister in the world of winning response" goes on to wonder "Is Composition Obsolete?" To him, our "insistent reliance on the teaching of written, rather than oral, composition will not prove particularly serviceable." "Because," he says, "communication-effectiveness is the major goal of training in composition for the general student body of the nation's schools, the priorities of educational concern and commitment should be reevaluated."[3]

The concern for social practicality that is contained in this attitude has had three important effects on the behavior of teachers. It has caused, first, what Virginia Burke has called the "insistence by many teachers upon 'objective' writing--whatever that is . . . ." Since "communication" in general goes on in relatively impersonal situations, it follows that students must be practiced in the more or less impersonal forms of writing: reports, analyses, criticisms, research papers, and so forth. Even in the early grades, they must learn to be general, to have what are now known as "concepts." The "sharing period," we are told is valuable in

developing ability to give directions, describe, explain, think critically, problem solve, plan, evaluate, express self creatively
enriching and developing of concepts
contributing information, suggestions, and materials for content and activities of social studies, science, and other curriculum areas.

If a first grade child should, for example, want to talk about his new shoes, the teacher should busy herself helping the children to establish "extensions of meaning" "around the subject of shoes." "Each time the topic presents itself, a new facet of meaning can be added to the concept 'shoes,'" the author says, sincerely enough, no doubt, though one could wish that "meaning" had been left unfaceted. And then she tells us that the child can learn about such concepts as size, materials, style, distribution (what the author calls with delightful simplicity "Where purchased"), friction, tidiness, production and distribution ("Workers who handle shoes," "Factory"), medium of exchange or measure of cost/value ("Money values").

In all the long list (and I have given only a selection of the "facets of meaning" to be extracted from a child's pleasure) there are no more than five items which suggest that for even the briefest moment the child who has "proudly displayed" his new shoes will be allowed to express his own feelings, whatever theyare. And this suggestion is by no means a strong one.

We have "Descriptive comments--how they [the shoes] look to the child, how they feel," which might let the child get in something about how *he* feels. But the series ends with "what they [the shoes] can do," so we are soon enough back with the practical and the utilitarian. I wonder, by the way, why the teacher made it "how they look *to the child*." Was it, perhaps, because her training--I will not say her instincts--told her that the normal schoolroom thing would be to describe "shoes" as they appear in general to people?

We also have "Song," "Poem," and "Story" as other "facets of meaning" to be added to the "concept 'shoes.'" But "Song" and "Poem" are explained in this way: "Do *we* know a song/poem about shoes? new shoes? Can *we* learn a new song/poem? Is a spontaneously [sic] created one forthcoming?" (The italics are mine.) Thus, it seems to me, both song and poem are treated as group, socializing "activity," rather than as the expressive act of an individual.

As for "Story," that is explained as "experiences in shopping for shoes, buying procedures, [and of all things] decision making." No doubt first graders make decisions, but that they should be bothered about "decision making" is so vast an oddity that, like Cicero, I shall not mention it. Or at least not go into it.

Some of you perhaps will be troubled because I have said nothing about the ethical question posed by this example. I am not unaware that the child who is "proudly displaying" his new shoes is also giving an early display of a strong sense of property values or at least of material things. But that is matter for another day, as is also the teacher's co-operation with him. In any event, perhaps the problem is a slight one, since the teacher says, "sharing time can rarely be construed as a substitute for the daily social studies period and must be held within time limits.[4]

Notions of social utility have also affected the way teachers behave, in their classrooms, towards language, both its study and its use. Since, Professor Kitzhaber says in his paper for the Dartmouth conference, "since vertical mobility is characteristic of a democratic social order, it is important to try to give every child a command of the standard dialect. Although it is obvious that not every child will become a banker or a physician or a government official--or the wife of one of these--and therefore need to

> speak the prestige dialect, one cannot be absolutely certain that he won't. Therefore the schools have to assume that nearly every child is potentially able to rise in the social scale to the point where he will find it important to shun "Ain't" and to prefer "he doesn't" to "he don't." To the average citizen this is clear enough so that, even though he himself may not be a habitual speaker of the standard dialect, he will usually want his children to master it for purely practical advantage.[5]

The felt need to see that children improve their language leads teachers to assert and, presumably, to believe such things as that in themes, students "are actually best tested for correct grammatical usage." (The quotation is from a real curriculum guide, and it may be worth noting that in the original the topics for many themes (which test the student's command of the spoken, prestige dialect) are drawn from literature; the effect on the child's feelings about literature must be obvious, or so I should suppose.) There are pressures toward conformity here that are troubling enough; but, speaking as a composition teacher, what I find especially troublesome is that when teachers say such things they are revealing that the theme is really only a test, and at that a test of the child's ability to manage the conventions of the printing shop. Teachers will, of course, tell students to find subjects they (the ambiguity is useful, though it was not intentional) are interested in. They will talk about writing honestly, sincerely, and in a lively manner. But then they will compliment the child on his neatness ("Good margins, Tommy."), or they will reprove him for confusing there and their, for not being able to "decide when to use adjectives or adverbs," or for being "confused as to when to use a finite verb or a participle."[6] Miss Burke says that our students leave us "suffering from the compulsive neurosis of linguistic correctness and cleanliness."[7] For an extended analysis of the effect of our duplicity and dishonesty, you may want to see William G. Perry, "The 600-word Theme and Human Dignity," *College English*, XIV (1954), 454-60.

On this whole point of tampering with the language of children, I can do no better than borrow not merely the authority but also the words of Martin Joos. (I call to your attention also Section V, Linguistics and the Teaching of Grammar and Composition in Professor Allen's *Readings in Applied English Linguistics* [New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958, 1964]; I myself would prefer a title that separates linguistics and grammar from composition, but this is an imperfect world, and anyway the essays do clarify the limits of the connection the title implies.)

As Joos says, then, the teacher's "aim should be to make the child's own [linguistic] resources available to him." That means, apparently, that the teacher must, so far as conscience, schoolroom, and parents will allow, let the child alone to do his own experimenting with his own grammatical and stylistic patterns and transformations--both those he knows and those he comes upon by accident or by more or less conscious searching. The teacher's chief--perhaps his only--workable device must be the very simple one of setting up an atmosphere in the classroom, and an attitude toward language and writing, which will encourage students to try to include, *in their writing*, some of the lively, accurate words, the complex grammatical structures, and the relatively sophisticated sentence patterns that they use more or less regularly and easily in their talking. The teacher can also demonstrate possibilities, sometimes by suggesting alternative phrasings for the student's own, sometimes--and probably better--by pointing out usable choices in the work of professional writers. What a teacher must not do is condemn a student if he follows the grammar of his own dialect or (as is often the case) what he imagines to be the grammar of his teacher's dialect and uses a construction that is not covered by the rules of standard English (or at least those of the schoolroom patois).

"Correct what you absolutely must," Joos says, "to salve your conscience, but don't call attention to what you are doing; instead, try to give the impression that you have heedlessly written your own forms without noticing what the pupil wrote; for instance, you must not circle or cross out what he wrote--you owe at least this much to common decency." After all, "the fact is that [the child] is always obeying a vast number of grammatical rules, a very small fraction of which happen to be different grammar rules from the ones that the critic subscribes to." Children, even lower-class children, "have just as much grammar as anybody, very little of it non-standard."

As far as the teaching of standard English is concerned, it is imperative, as Joos says, for teachers and children to "come to terms with each other--and of course all the burden of coming to terms must rest upon the one who is supposed to be wiser and better informed--on the basis that usages can be learned without condeming those which they replace, that the learner has an indefeasible right to speak as he likes without school penalties, while the teacher has no right in this respect but only the duty to demonstrate what usages are profitable [oh, dear] in the adult world." Such a reform in attitude would bring about enormous humanizing changes in teaching procedure. Teachers and students alike would be saved from the rare, the rather awful burden of having to adopt during the school day (or at least in the English class) the "special schoolroom voice-qualities, melodies, and of course words and grammar patterns" that now signal the general unreality of the English teaching business. And this would certainly freshen the atmosphere of the English classes, and perhaps even make it easier for children to want to use the middle-class-tied forms of American English.[8]

Objectivity or impersonality. Correctness. These lead right on to--indeed, they may be causes of--the third piece of teacher behavior that I want to talk about. I have in mind what perhaps may be called our image of the writings that students give us. Probably most of us most of the time assume, with greater or lesser conviction, that children's writings are (or should be treated as) "compositions"[9] and that compositions are, then, practice exercises which children must do in school so that later, presumably in life, they will "write more clearly, more accurately, and with surer skill and power." It would be interesting, I think, to investigate the incidence, in articles on teaching composition, of terms like "skills," "proficiency," and "standards of good writing," for surely it is around the notion of increasing the child's control of such abstractions that teachers, except, perhaps, those in the primary grades, organize work in composition. As a result we tend to judge the writings of children by their differences from what we notice when we read the highly edited writings of adult professional writers.

We need a rhetoric for children's writing so that we can read their works and judge them (since judge we must) with sympathy and taste that at least approach the condition of being principled. We need to know what kinds of writings are to be expected from children according to their varying abilities as they progress (or at least move) through the grades. What is a good work from a fourth grader? From an eighth grader?

For some people, it is clear, such questions are, if not answered, at least on the way to being so. "Any teacher of English," says Professor Kellogg W. Hunt,

> can tell a fourth grade theme from a twelfth-grade theme. Probably anyone [in the audience] could make still finer distinctions [if given the chance?]: he could tell the average fourth-grade theme from the average eighth-grade theme [if he were called upon to do so?]

These discriminations would be based upon differences in vocabulary and sentence structures. Nor need the perceptions be merely intuitive, the results of "feelings."

> For the last thirty years we have known at least three things about the development of language structure. First, as children mature they tend to produce more words on any given subject. They have more to say. Second, as children mature, the sentences they use tend to be longer. Third, as children mature a larger proportion of their clauses are subordinate clauses.

Professor Hunt (and many others with him: Walter Loban, Ruth Strickland, and perhaps Basil Bernstein) pretty clearly think that we are going to find out what we need to know about children's writings by devising more and more refined measurements of "syntactic maturity." It looks to me as if this measurement is going to result in a rather gross formula: *pace* Hemingway (and perhaps even Professor Hunt), here quantity seems to be not merely a necessary but perhaps even a sufficient indicator of maturity. The more the words, the longer the sentences, the more (and longer) the subordinate clauses, then the greater the maturity of the writing. And presumably, the more mature, the better.

But what Professor Hunt wants to count is words, clauses, and sentences taken as discrete, and indeed as merely physical, items, marks in sequence upon a page. But consider Professor Hunt's data not as items but as elements of a true structure, parts of wholes, members bound in organic situations. Do that, and the inadequacy of these measurements as criteria of value (or even of maturity, syntactic or otherwise) becomes apparent.

Take, for example, Professor Hunt's own way of illustrating "syntactic maturity." In fourth grade writing, he says, we are likely to find paired main clauses, such as:

> There was a lady next door and the lady was a singer.
>
> Moby Dick was a very big whale. He lived in the sea.
>
> We have a lot on Lake Tolquin. This lot has a dock on it.
>
> Beautiful Joe was a dog, he [sic] was born on a farm.
>
> One colt was trembling. It was lying down on the hay.

I myself think that sentences 2, 4, and 5 are pretty much all right as they stand, and I would like to find more like them in the writing of freshmen. Sentence 1 doesn't bother me a great deal; as for Sentence 3, I am not sure that the trouble there is merely syntactic anyway. But Professor Hunt wants to improve all the sentences, or at least to show what they would be like if written by, first, eighth graders and, second, students in high school with high syntactic maturity. So he takes each of the sentences through two stages. In the first, one of the independent clauses is reduced to a subordinate. In the second, the subordinate clause is further reduced to a phrase or word modifier. Thus:

> Moby Dick was a very big whale who lived in the sea.
>
> [Moby Dick, a very big whale, lived in the sea.]
>
>> But should not eighth graders (who have the syntactic maturity to use subordinate clauses) and high schoolers (who can use appositives) be expected to know that "in the sea" is tautological, since all whales are denizens of the sea; and that "lived in the sea" (=lived in Cincinnati, or lived in a stucco house) is a childish figure?
>
> There was a lady next door who was a singer.
>
> There was a lady next door, a singer.
>
>> But this is not a normal sentence. It is a part of one. Most people would want to complete the rhythmic pattern of the sentence with some sort of an adjectival clause: "a singer who . . . ." Or so I should think.
>>
>> Another alternative, assuming that the child had only a simple fact in mind, would be to delete the anticipatory "there was," making the sentence just "The lady next door was a singer."
>
> On Lake Tolquin we have a lot which has a dock on it.
>
>> One sees why freshmen write such oddly un-English sentences.
>
> Our lot on Lake Tolquin has a dock on it.
>
>> Neater. A normal sentence. But one wonders in what possible context it need occur.
>
> Beautiful Joe was a dog that was born on a farm.
>
> Beautiful Joe was a dog born on a farm.
>
>> It has been many years since I read *Beautiful Joe*, and my memory holds only the facts that her puppies were

destroyed, her tail docked (the latter presumably for show purposes). So at the moment, I cannot catch the relevance of the dog's birthplace (if I may use the term). But just as sentences these two strike me as extremely odd.

Surely "that was born on a farm" cries for some kind of completion: for example, "and starved to death in a city." Or rather we expect such a completion from an eighth grader. The original version (with the paired main clauses) does not bother us in the same way because the grammatically simple sentences express precisely the way the writer has taken in the facts. And more important, the structure of the sentences does not contain any implications or suggestions that need fulfillment. The structure arouses no expectations.

The second sentence seems to me to have the formal characteristics of the English sentence; but I do not think it is a real one.

One colt which was lying down on the hay was trembling.

One trembling colt was lying down on the hay.

The first sentence is so punctuated by Professor Hunt. But I should have thought that the "one" makes the subordinate clause an additive, that is non-restrictive, modifier.

These sentences, I have to confess, quite defeat me. They seem to me to be wrong. But why are they wrong?

Perhaps the feeling of wrongness comes from seeing them together. The pairing forces one to ask why a subordinate idea in the first ("which was lying down on the hay") should be put into a main clause in the second. And of course, the converse: why should the idea of trembling be reduced from a main statement to a word modifier?

No doubt having the context would help. But Professor Hunt does not, so far as I am able to tell, include context as an influence on the sentences that he is counting.

Let me give just one more example of the effect of Professor Hunt's approach to student writing. He cites as an example of mature clause consolidation this sentence about Moby Dick: "He was a rare white whale with a crooked jaw." The sentence, he says, consolidates five simple clauses. (Does this whole obsession with clause consolidation go back, in Professor Hunt's case at least, to the principles alleged to be at work in the development of the "kernel sentences" of Chomskyan grammar?) Professor Hunt approves such consolidation, but he regrets that even this relatively mature eighth grader "failed to consolidate clauses where he might have." And he gives us what the child wrote:

> Moby Dick was a dangerous whale. People had never been able to catch him. He was a rare white whale with a crooked jaw. He was a killer too. He was long and strong.

Again I have to say that that passage seems to me a quite satisfactory, indeed an absolutely fine piece of writing. Note the rise and fall in sentence length (6, 8, 10, 5, 5 words; 9, 11, 11, 6, 5 syllables). Note the brilliant rhythm of "rare white whale," and the alliteration in "white whale with." Note the change in initial sounds from "rare white whale" to "crooked jaw." Note the good cadences in "killer too" and "long and strong."

Yet in the interest of syntactic maturity this wonderful piece of writing must be revised to:

> Moby Dick was a dangerous whale that people had never been able to catch. [He was a rare white whale with a crooked jaw.] He was a killer too, long and strong.

One is grateful that the middle sentence is left unconsolidated. But even so, the effect of the tampering is pretty dispiriting, it seems to me. The revised passage is not absolutely bad, I suppose. But still what life does it have, except the spurious sort given by the really quite unpleasantly literary construction that Professor Hunt has found for the last sentence. Otherwise the writing is quite toneless, a piece of ordinary bureaucratic prose, of a sort that students meet so much of anyway that it hardly seems necessary, let alone good, to teach it to them. And it is a question to be asked what effect such fiddling would have on a child who had the ear and feeling to write the original paragraph.[10]

Anyone interested in the topic of "syntactic maturity" should see L. A. Sherman, Analytics of Literature (Boston: Ginn, 1901), especially chapters XIX (The Literary Sentence Length in English Prose), XX (The Decrease of Predication), XXI (Co-ordination of Clauses), XXII (Subordination of Clauses), XXIII (Suppression of Clauses), XXV (The Weight of Styles), and XXVI (The New Articulation of Clauses). New Methods for the Study of Literature, by Edith Rickert (Chicago: 1927) is also helpful.

As you can no doubt tell--or at least feel--I find all this current interest in children's sentences and their paragraphs[11] very worrying. It focusses our attention on mere style, and then in a not very sophisticated way. It re-enforces and indeed legitimizes our tendency to view children's writings as inadequate representations of adult writings. It heightens our awareness of errors and weaknesses, lessens our appreciation of felicities and strengths. And of course it turns us aside from what, as I have said, ought to be our chief concern at the moment: the development of a rhetoric of children's writings that would provide us a moderately firm theoretical foundation for our actions in the classroom.

To get at the principles of a children's rhetoric we would have to ask questions like the following. What do we mean by a material content that is worth while, in the case of children's writing, that is? How do children of various ages express appropriate personal understanding of their subjects? At what point can it be said that the signs of the influence of television, books, the school interfere with the authenticity of the writing? How and to what extent can various kinds of children be expected to discover general significance in their subjects? What quantity of detail is to be expected in different sorts of writing, from different sorts of children, at different ages? How are the relevance, the significance, and the interest of details to be measured, or at least to be assessed in relation to the ages and capacities of children? What kinds of structures (in sentences, paragraphs, extended writings) do children use? Granting Professor Hunt's indexes of "syntactic maturity," what is their meaning? What, if any, are the relationships between the grammatical complexity of sentences and the logical or material complexity of their content? Is the correlation positive? If it is, then when should complexity of both sorts be expected? What kinds (genres) of writing may be expected of children of different capacities, different ages? What are the kinds of modern writing? Should children be expected to practice them, if we know them?

It is in the light of these questions--rather practical teaching questions, I suppose they might be called--it is in their light that I want to take up my second topic, the place of rhetoric in the education of composition teachers. I am not going to be talking about the "new" rhetoric,[12] so called, however interesting that topic may be to some. What I want to do is take a fairly simple look at classical rhetoric, as I have been able to see it. For it seems to me that, if we think of the rhetoricians as what indeed they really were, teachers of composition--and apparently very successful ones--we may perhaps find some useful hints toward organizing our own practice.

Rhetoric fills what many people engaged in teaching composition feel to be a very pressing need. That is, it gives a content to the composition class, and in these post-Brunerian days, also a structure to the subject. Now no longer must we suppose, as Theodore Morrison used to at Harvard, that the content of composition "must in a real sense be the student's content . . . ." Nor need we follow him into subjectivity and inanity, as some would say, by supposing that

> A student should explain, argue, summarize, analyze, criticize; report scenes, describe characters, try to create the impression and atmosphere of a home town, or the life of the people he knows. He should read books, present their content accurately, compare them with other books, distinguish between different views, and advance his own opinions. He should, in short, do as much as he can of the work of an intelligent reflective mind. He should know, feel, and judge, and he should give orderly expression to the upshot of his knowledge, his feeling, his judgment.[13]

That passage has always seemed to me one of the very best descriptions of our trade; but as I typed it this time, I was very much impressed by how much of it could be derived from the curriculum of the Roman rhetorical schools, as set forth by Quintillian. It would not be wrong to call the passage a conflation of ancient and modern. In the first sentence, for example, "explain, argue, summarize, analyze, criticize; report scenes, describe characters" is a pretty good description of the kind of activities, exercises that were the staple of instruction in the rhetorical schools. But "try to create the impression and atmosphere of a home town, or the life of the people he knows" are purely modern exercises. I hope you will keep that difference in mind, as I continue the discussion of rhetoric and its place in training for the classroom.

As we know, rhetoric, the systematic description of the successful conventions of speech-making, was developed in Sicily in the second quarter of the fifth century B. C. The first *techne* is said to have been written by one Corax; his manual epitomized the practices in pleading in actions of recovery that had been developed in Sicily in the litigations over property ownership during and following the various revolutions of the fifth century. And ancient discussions of the nature and province of rhetoric leave the impression that the art (I do not think that any Greek or Roman would have thought of it as a discipline, as so many do today) never quite escaped the consequences of its origin. Neither associating it with politics nor extending its area to anything that is subject for speech quite purged rhetoric of its connection with forensic persuasion. In classical thought, the defining content of rhetoric was its prescriptions for successful arguments on problematic questions having neither certain nor necessary answers. Probably this fact was what forced Aristotle into inventing the term "enthymeme" for the syllogism in a speech; as he says,

> There are few facts of the "necessary" type that can form the basis of rhetorical syllogisms. Most of the things about which we make decisions, and into which therefore we inquire, present us with alternative possibilities. For it is about our actions that we deliberate and inquire, and all our actions have a contingent character; hardly any of them are determined by necessity . . . . It is evident, therefore, that the propositions forming the basis of enthymemes,

> though some of them may be "necessary," will most of them be only usually true.

Whatever the refinements in definitions and classification (especially as to matters of style) that the rhetoricians came to use, there is no evidence that they led to any changes, still less developments, in the communication problems they discussed. These remained those associated with persuading popular audiences to make decisions on questions which, in general, did not allow of necessary answers. I have been unable to find any reason to disagree with Marrou's suggestion that rhetoric was little more than a codification, condensed and perfected, of the practices that wandering Sophists taught to young Athenians anxious for success as "citizen-speakers."[14] After all, there is Aristotle's harsh comment: perhaps the duty of rhetoric is no more than

> to deal with such matters as we deliberate upon, but without systematic rules, in the hearing of persons who cannot take a general view of [an argument having] many stages, or follow a lengthy chain of argument.

For our purposes, as composition teachers in more or less modern schools, the significance of rhetoric is precisely that it *did* begin in quite a narrow and restricted set of problems in communication and en-formed discourse, that it *was* originally only a recording of what various specialists or technicians had found, on the basis of their own practice and observation, to be successfull (that is, accepted) means of persuasion in pleadings before popular bodies. As a system of education, a curriculum--which is what it became--rhetoric can quite properly be seen as having a very pronounced technological and vocational character.

In a very real sense, the teaching-technique of the rhetorician seems to have been to stock his students' minds with the material and forms of the various kinds of speeches, and to train them to make ready and present use thereof by finding "that which may be pertinent to the purpose which [they might have] in consideration." (I am paraphrasing Bacon on "invention," in the *Advancement*, II, xiii, 6.) What the classical rhetoricians saw, the basic observation from which all their practice stemmed, is that a child does not learn "to write," nor does he learn "writing" either. He may learn at least some of the signs of the prestige dialect (other things being equal), he may learn the qualities of diction and syntax characterizing some one or several styles, he may learn certain patterns for achieving sentence variety, as it is called, he may learn the conventions of structure, he may learn the types of material appropriate to some few different occasions and purposes. How much he learns depends on what different things his different teachers emphasize and teach. But in all cases, the child learns, if at all, quite specific skills--to use the modern cant term--which are skills having as their object the achievement of the patterns of formal, published discourse.

The great advantage that the classical rhetoricians had over their successors--from the eighteenth century or even the Renaissance to the present--

was that they could tell their students how to make some particular things. They did not have to work with unanalyzable terms, such as "writing" or "learning to write." When Socrates analogized writing and cookery, he was not just being whimsical. Grounding his figure was the prevalent Greek habit of looking at art as making, a bringing of material into form by means of an agent. Working from this assumption, the classical rhetorician could show his students how to take parts and put them together according to recognized schemes. This being so, he could work out a real curriculum, for he knew what was simple and what complex, what was primary and what advanced. The essential and controlling purpose of his curriculum was to prepare his students to write certain kinds of speeches; not "speeches in general" but the kind of speeches required by a rather limited number of communication situations, all involving establishing "cases" before audiences most of whose members would have been either trained in his ways, or at least would have grown accustomed to them.

What I am suggesting is that we, too, should find some specific forms of writing that we can in fact say are usable in the classroom; that is, that children will find interest in making and from success in making which they will receive some pleasure. But, you will say, such an approach to composition teaching shows too little interest in creativity and individual differences. And so it would, if we tried to teach what the classical rhetoricians taught, and from the assumptions that they operated on. But since the Renaissance,

> thanks to the influence of Bacon and Descartes, man has tended more and more to believe that his most important deliberations must be conducted in the light of all the particular facts that bear upon them. No longer does he feel that he can draw predominantly from common sense, general reason, or the wisdom that rests largely upon deductions from analogous past experience. When Descartes abandoned his belief in tradition and custom and decided to reconstitute his knowledge in terms of the direct observation of the great book of the world, he not only took a decisive step toward the creation of modern science, but he also represented in his own personal life the change that was coming over the whole intellectual life of Europe. And that change was too vast to leave rhetoric unaffected.[15]

Treating invention, which prior to the Renaissance, was the center of the rhetorical art, as a process of investigating the resources of the individual that are relevant to the problem at hand (rather than as a discovery of accepted arguments, analogies, illustrations, and examples) will, I should think, take care of the objection, in part. I think we can do somewhat more by trying to find out just exactly what students do when they write, so that we can see where individuals need help. In other words, I think we ought to look a little bit more at the processes that are included under the general term "writing," and perhaps a little less at the properties of the papers written by students, who because of our own ignorance remain largely unconscious of their actions in writing, both those that are strong and those that need strengthening.

Willa Cather once asked a group of English teachers why they had children in their classes spend so much time analyzing the formal properties of literary works, instead of letting them talk about their responses to books. The teachers told her that analysis was easier to teach, and that they didn't know anything else to do anyway. With very few changes--and those quite obvious--the anecdote could be turned from the literature to the composition class. For it is clear that there is little that goes on in the composition class that has to do with the art of writing. And this is so because writing--the art, in the Greek sense of art that I mentioned a moment ago--is just what most teachers of composition don't know about, don't have any feeling for. Since they do not themselves write, they do not know about, for example, "the stages through which a story, essay, or poem must normally pass before it reaches a presentable form"[16]--the tedious story

> of scribbled notes, often disjointed and sprawling; of rewritings; of eliminations and scribbled additions; of more rewritings; of later reshapings of the whole, new balancings, better proportionings; and of a final reconsideration of each part for its effect upon the reader. And after that, when the creative fire has spent itself, the mechanical editing into a properly spelled, punctuated, paragraphed piece, matters which the schoolroom is prone to put as the first and only consideration.[17]

As an environment for learning or practicing the art of writing, the composition class is not merely inadequate, it is probably quite obstructive or even destructive. This fact is nowhere clearer than when one tries to imagine writers having to work within the confines of a composition class, trying to do there what they say they do when they write.

How could the artificial work rules and random standards and prescriptions of the composition class help students, if writing does indeed go on as in this description by an author who says that he doesn't even make an outline?

> When I am working on a piece of writing my mind keeps busy on it during my spare moments. While I am riding on the train, or even the subway, puttering about the garden, or sometimes (a bad practice) waiting to go to sleep at night I will be revolving the phraseology of various vital paragraphs.[18]

Here is another description of an author's habits that is just as upsetting of the niceties of the composition class.

> I do not like to write. Invariably I put off whatever
> I have to do, dreading the strain, and turning to any

> possible diversion. [Recall my first paragraphs, if you will.] When the clock or calendar tells me I can wait no longer, I generally find myself growing excited. Out of this excitement comes an idea about which my thoughts swarm in a crowded confusion. I cannot, however, begin until my opening sentence comes suddenly into my mind, generally with all the words in place, and always in the rhythm and tone of the entire article or chapter or section which is to be written. Thereafter my work is mere scrupulous obstinacy . . . . If I am in a sensible mood I ordinarily work no more than three or four hours at a stretch, but if my material proves resistant, I am likely to lose my senses and go on for ten or even twenty hours, struggling in the grip of an obscure compulsion, and raging at myself for my stupidity. When I am exhausted I give up, always perfectly convinced that I shall never write another line. Then, after sleeping or deliberately losing myself in something else, customarily I come back and finish the task without excessive effort.[19]

If the composition class has little time to accommodate the vagaries of the habits of writers, how much less has it for the moments that are the most important in writing, the ones "between the birth of an idea and the setting down of the first word" which are "the moments of actual composition." As more than one writer has said, "most writing is done away from the typewriter, away from the desk . . . . [It] occurs in the quiet, silent moments, while you're walking or shaving or playing a game or whatever; or even talking to someone you're not vitally interested in. You're working, your mind is working. on this problem in the back of your head. So, when you get to the machine it's a mere matter of transfer."[20]

It is in these "quiet, silent moments" that the significant and profitable playing of the imagination goes on. Then it is that beginnings and endings are tried out; sentences are devised, rejected, reformulated; words are sought for, details remembered. Then it is that ideas are explored, material collected, approaches felt out. Sometimes the shape and tone of the whole may be discovered, though with professional writers it is perhaps more often the case that what is discovered is no more than a single half-formed thought, elusive or intractable, which is somehow demanding of expression.

And of course there are a whole series of such moments during the development of a piece of writing. For there is really no single beginning to composition. What we call the first word of a work comes into being only when the work is finished and ready for reading. In the actual development of a piece, how many ideas are born, how many first words are written can only be guessed. For it is probably true that most writers "work from some deep down place" without knowing "exactly what's going to happen"[21] until after it has, when they have to begin editing their production, "giving it a reasonable shape, an explicit coherence."[22]

Since at our best we do ask our students to behave like writers, I suggest that we should now begin to devote a little of our scholarly and analytical skills to discovering just how far the processes of writing, as all our testimony gives them to us, can be translated into the realm of the classroom, can be used as the basis for teaching techniques. How much more interesting might our teaching then be, how much more useful, than now it is, when our time is spent directing our students through mere exercises in language and thought.

Notes

[1] The English Teacher Preparation Study, jointly undertaken as a two-year project by the National Council of Teachers of English, the Modern Language Association, and the National Association of State Departments of Teacher Education and Certification with the support of the U. S. Office of Education. After a series of regional conferences a final national conference resulted in the final form of guidelines to be published in the summer of 1967.

[2] Glenda Kuhlman, "Speak, See, Hear: The Needs of the Terminal Student," *College Composition and Communication*, XVII (December 1966), 241-245.

[3] Solomon S. Simonson, "Is Composition Obsolete," *English Journal*, LVI (January 1967), 100-2 and 108, at pp. 100-1, 102.

[4] Thelma Carlson, "The Sharing Period in First Grade," *Elementary English*, XLIII (October 1966), 612-14 and 618, at pp. 613, 614.

[5] Albert R. Kitzhaber, "What is English," Mimeograph copy, distributed at Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English, Dartmouth College, 20 August-16 September 1966.

[6] Vivian Buchan, "An Open Letter to a Beginning Language Arts Teacher," *Elementary English*, XLIII (October 1966), 615-18, at p. 615.

[7] *Loc. cit.*

[8] The quotations from Joos are from his article "Language and the School Child," Harvard Educational Review, XXXIV (1964), at pp. 207-10 *passim*. The material surrounding the quotations is my own, from the Introduction to the Northwestern Curriculum Center *Lessons in the Basic Processes of Composition*, which was written long before I experienced the corrupting energy of British rhetoric at Dartmouth.

[9] See Note 10.

[10] I take my examples from the most recent article of Professor Hunt's that I know about: "Recent Measures in Syntactic Development," *Elementary English*, XLIII (November 1966), 732-39. (I wonder if the title should not read "Recent Developments in Syntactic Measurement.")

[11] At the moment Francis Christensen is probably the best known and the most influential worker in this vein. See his articles "A Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence," *College Composition and Communication*, XIV

(October 1963), 155-61; "A generative Rhetoric of the Paragraph," *Ibid*., XVI (October 1965), 144-56.

See also A. L. Becker, "A Tagmemic Approach to Paragraph Analysis," *Ibid*., XVI (December 1965), 237-42.

There is an excellent corrective article by Paul C. Rodgers, Jr., "A Discourse-centered Rhetoric of the Paragraph," *Ibid*., XVII (February 1966), 2-11. See also the interchange among Christensen, Becker, and Rodgers, *Ibid*., XVII (May 1966), 60-80.

Except for Rodgers, the writers show a typical nineteenth century interest in the analysis of finished pieces. See the chapters on sentences and paragraphs in the older editions of Perrin's *Writers Guide and Index to English* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman).

[12] For suggestive reports on the "new" rhetorics, see Robert M. Gorrell, "Very Like a Whale," *College Composition and Communication*, XVI (October 1965), 138-43; James J. Murphy, "The Four Faces of Rhetoric," *Ibid*., XVII (May 1966), 55-59. Some fascinating historical reflections on the development of the interest in rhetoric in the last few years may be found in the article by Virginia Burke, cited *supra*, p. 4. An assertion of the continuity of the rhetorical tradition seems to be made in Joseph Schwartz, "Kenneth Burke, Aristotle, and the Future of Rhetoric," *Ibid*., XVII (December 1966), 210-16.

[13] Theodore Morrison, "A Philosophy for Required Freshman English," *College English*, II (May 1941), 785-97.

[14] Cf. Karl R. Wallace, "The Primacy of Substance and Ideas in the Teaching of Practical Discourse," *English Journal*, LIII (January 1964), 1-9.

[15] W. S. Howell, "Renaissance Rhetoric and Modern Rhetoric; A Study in Change," in Joseph Schwartz and John Rycenga, *The Province of Rhetoric* (New York: Ronald, 1965), pp. 292-308, at p. 301; the essay is a revision of the last chapter of Howell's *Logic and Rhetoric in England: 1500-1700* (Princeton, 1956). I am not aware that the change has been recognized by most of those who are talking about rhetoric today.

[16] Hughes Mearns, *Creative Power* (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1929), p. 274. This is an important and too little known book. Properly used, it would provide a basis for organizing a composition class.

[17] Hughes Mearns, *Creative Youth* (New York: Doubleday, 1925), pp. 7-8.

[18] Henry Pratt Fairchild, quoted in Josephine K. Piercy, *Modern Writers at Work* (New York: MacMillan, 1930), pp. 136-39. Another invaluable book for the composition teacher.

[19] Carl Van Doren, quoted in Piercy, pp. 195-6.

[20] Henry Miller. Interview from *The Paris Review* in *Writers at Work* (Second series, New York: Vicking, 1962), p. 172.

[21] Miller, *loc*. *cit*., p. 171.

[22] John Middleton Murry in Piercy, p. 206.

COMPOSITION IN THE HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM

Wallace Kennedy

While trying to nurture some self-assurance for the part I play in this conference, I find myself bound in shallows and in miseries. If there is a tide in the affairs of men, there must be tides of self-assurance during anticipation for affairs, but preparing for this affair, I missed the flood. Fifteen years of trying to teach writing, or composition, or rhetoric, (whatever the term in fashion) has made me feel miserably inadequate to say anything about the task.

Sometimes I'm full of self-assurance. When I am, I've been told I put on something of a high manner, and I probably was wearing it when Professor Harold Allen decided to give me today's assignment. One of the reasons I am sometimes full of self-assurance is that I'm one of those teachers you hear about whose former students return from college to tell me I'm a better English teacher than their college English teachers are. (They always say "you were a better teacher," though I trust they mean "you are.") Then they spoil the compliment by telling me how *bad* their college English teachers are. Compliments like those remind me of the exchange between Mattie Silver and Ethan Frome about the probability of someone proposing marriage to Mattie. She says she ain't noticed any great rush so far, and Ethan says, "Why Mattie, lots of folks might ask you. I mean, take now, I would, if I could." Mattie's reply, you recall is, "Course sayin' that don't mean anything. Still 'n' all, I'm awful glad to hear you say it." I guess I know that being compared favorably to college English teachers by my former students doesn't mean anything either. Still 'n' all, I like to hear it.

When my students tell me of the hard times they are having with Freshman Composition (whatever the course is called, it's designed to show Freshmen they can't write), my self-assurance, no matter how high, ebbs away. But after all, I guess it's a general condition, this lack of self-assurance about being able to teach students to write.

Gene Piché in the January 1967 *Minnesota English* reviews some of the developments in the teaching of composition over the past quarter century. A. M. Tibbetts covers the same epoch in "A Short History of Dogma and Nonsense" for the Journal of the *Conference for College Composition and Communication*, but since analysis wearies humor, I'll neglect Mr. Tibbetts and quote from Mr. Piché.

> I suspect we've long been uneasy about the perennial, episodic approach to the paragraph which neither goes nor grows, But at least since the appearance of

Jerome Bruner's The Process of Education, that uneasiness has become a positive embarrassment.

The logos of Gene Piché's article contains suggestions of several concepts which might be used in constructing a stronger theory of composition, and while I think those concepts might be considered in our discussions during this conference, I'm most interested at the moment in reasons for our uneasiness and embarrassment. One of the reasons, Gene Piché suggests, is that we have long been devoted to a repetitious, prescriptive body of advice that was professed to be practical, but has, quite obviously, been ineffectual. Practicality, Mr. Piché says, is such a slim theory of composition, and so the title of his article is "Let's Teach Composition--Impractically."

I guess that title appeals to me because I have tried to follow many of the guidelines advanced under the theory of practical composition. Of one thing about those guidelines, I'm sure: they are grossly impractical in the opinions of many high school students. The ambiguity of practical is comforting, though, isn't it? In the theory of "practical composition" I find it distressing, but as used by Professor Wallace Douglas to describe questions we might use for developing a rhetoric of children's writings, I find the word pertinent.

After finally getting to a reference to our key note, perhaps my remarks from now on will gain more strength if I place them within the framework of Professor Douglas' three points. Is it theology or geometry, I wonder, that is responsible for making three such a reassuring pattern?

First, attitude appropriate for a classroom where learning about writing occurs. (You notice I did not say "where learning how to write takes place?") My distress about practicality as the purpose of composition is mainly because of an attitude of relentless self-assurance that seems to pervade the writing of those who advocate this or that practical approach. Students preparing to teach English should surely be encouraged to read our trade journals, but I hope not too many of them will become as fatigued as I am from their consistent tone. English teachers, so able to recognize and label the superficiality of advocacy in journalism and advertising, when writing "How I Did It" articles, advocate with the self-assurance of an auctioneer. Teachers of other subjects are as bad, I know. So many voices, fuming so much advocacy, makes teaching smell like an unaired classroom, and maybe that's why we need to hold so many conferences, and project so many institutes, and institute so many projects.

Attitude appropriate for an English classroom! I must try to get back on the text. Text? The texts are just as bad as the articles, let me tell you. May I quote from just one? A very practical one? This is from the foreword:

> Clear Writing (Honest. That's the title.) assumes that either writer, student or professional, may succeed or fail according to whether he has or has not solved the problems of clear communication. In other words, the student who reads Clear Writing is made to feel that he is not in any special category but is dealing with the universal problems of all effective exposition.

Now there is an appropriate attitude for the classroom! Don't think of a student's problems as special, just give him some universal problems to work.

> However, Clear Writing talks directly to the college student. (In second person, both singular and plural.) It (Clear Writing) also tries to be efficient in its teaching.

Well, it's now an old text, and much better, really than its foreword.

My concern is not just that I tire of so much persuasive rhetoric. It's that I presume that nobody has much chance to learn in a milieu of sustained self-assurance. Everyone knows that intrinsic to both learning and teaching is the rise and fall of self-assurance. If self-assurance ebbs away, it has to flow in somewhere, doesn't it? How about a bit of it flowing into students?

There. I finally got back to attitude appropriate for the classroom. Where the study of writing goes on. In the junior and senior high schools. Where students are adolescents. Or ought to be. We call them teen agers, and according to Edgar Friedenberg, we should proudly call them adolescents. If we keep on as we are, depriving them of their rightful growth stage, adolescence, which is the growth stage for seeking one's own identify, may vanish away, Friedenberg suggests. May I nominate Edgar Z. Friedenberg's The Vanishing Adolescent as supplementary reading for students preparing to teach English in secondary schools? For the sake of attitude appropriate for the classroom, maybe it should be required reading.

Awhile back I said that the guidelines presented by advocates of practical composition seem impractical to high school students. Our ideas, or at least ideas of the practicalists, of what is practical are not the same as the ideas of adolescents about what is practical. We measure them and their writing (as Professor Douglas shows) by some "adult" standard to show them how they fail. (Another book I nominate for every preparing teacher: John Holt's How Children Fail.) That we are guilty of relying on standards that are scarcely sensible, let along appropriate, to judge writing of elementary school children worries me as it worries Professor Douglas. That we are more guilty of using insensible and inappropriate standards with adolescents worries me even more. Children are tougher than adolescents.

Every age before adulthood is a growth stage, and according to our language, the final growth stage is adolescence. The reason our language tells us this, is that in Western societies, it has been true. But in our attitudes in the classroom, especially where writing that is "practical" is taught, we try to put this truth aside. Anything that engages his mind is "practical" to a growing child. He may even be intrigued about what he will do when he grows up, but not for long. Not all the time. Not, especially, when his future is urged upon him as a set of conditions that he must be ready to accept. Such conditions he resists with the healthy organic needs of trying to soak up and make choices about his present daily condition. So he has much to write "about."

The attitude we must carry to the classroom is, as Professor Douglas has said, an attitude of trying to find out what goes on in a student's mind as he struggles to write. What we do in the classroom must show a student that we are eager to learn what he wants to say as he tries to put into words what he has in his head. If a student can believe that is our attitude, I think he will carry away the attitude that how he puts into words what he has in his head is worth his own concern.

Now what can a teacher who has already served his "preparation time" (You have perhaps surmised I escaped before serving all of it.) say about rhetoric and its place in the preparation of composition teachers? Well, first of all, I want to say that I think any student going forth to teach rhetoric would appreciate the kind of explanation Professor Douglas gave about how the art of rhetoric originated and developed. Another observation I make as a teacher who is still a student. What I have learned about teaching has been not only from practice. Much of what I know, I learned from example. When I first began giving lessons about how to get on to paper what is in the mind, I searched back to my first college course as the main reference about how to proceed. That course was called Freshman Rhetoric. It was taught at the University of North Dakota by Miss Valborg Oslund, and it was, for me, a splendid experience. It helped move me out of pre-med into the ranks of prospective English teachers, against, I should add, the confident counsel of Miss Oslund. Her attitude was to try to learn what was taking place in her students' minds, an attitude I found less apparent in my professors of inorganic chemistry and mathematics.

Besides an appropriate, contagious attitude, though, I think the design of classroom activity in courses of rhetoric should be as exemplary for the practice of future English teachers as it can be made to be. We are being asked that at this conference we begin to devote our scholarly skills to discovering how much of the process of writing can be used as the basis for teaching techniques. I trust the job will not end here. I wonder if college students, in all courses of rhetoric, can add their scholarly skills, however meager or strong, to this discovery. Can rhetoric courses be planned, that is, so that students will be required to discover as much as they can about processes of writing? Can courses be designed to also require that students talk about in class how these processes can be learned and practiced? Such a course, I believe, is the kind that will do the very most for the common purposes of us all.

The prospect of such discovery about the processes of writing by students taking rhetoric in college, brings me at last, to the third point made by Professor Douglas. However, I shall not talk much about the process of writing as students are typically engaged in that process in secondary schools.

Frequently, before falling asleep, I semi-consciously create little mise en scenes of classroom activities. My hope is, that if I describe some of these to you, you will see both what frequently and occasionally occurs in a composition classroom in secondary schools as I know them.

Here is the first one. Over on stage right sit rows of students, mask-faced, all focused on a teacher standing stage left. Between students and teacher stands a barrier, a speaker's stand or a teacher's desk. As students slump over and behind open books, the teacher, gesturing with and pointing at the book, occasionally writing on and pointing to the chalkboard behind him, explains and motivates a writing lesson. (You understand of course that any other activity than the teacher's is in this playlet due to the teacher's lack of control over the students. In this scene, the teacher must dominate or all hell breaks loose.)

Another one, more up-to-date. Same rows of desks, maybe running diagonally down stage for better picturization, the students focus on the teacher down stage left. (Here the students faces can be better seen by the audience.) The teacher stands closer to the students, beside an overhead projector, and the students sit slouched back, looking first at the teacher, then at the screen, then back at the teacher. Control is less difficult here, and explanation, motivation and some evaluation can be accomplished with the help of the overhead projector.

Pretty dull plays? If I start with those I usually fall asleep before I get to this next one. This time the mise en scene is not the typical English classroom. That's obvious because it looks so busy, so disorganized, so messy, Students are at tables, but they are turned to look at the teacher who occupies something like a thrust stage up center. The explanation, and I guess the motivation is stacked somewhere in the explanation, is quick, specific, about one particular type of operation. Time is short because students have to work where the materials are. Students quickly get started, and while they work, the teacher works too. Occasionally a student comes over to see how the teacher works. Some of the students even look at what other students are doing, and some of them even talk to each other about what they are doing.

This activity continues, busy, noisy, but with apparent concentration. Then a grinning student takes what he has done to the teacher. The teacher looks, shrugs, asks "What do you think?" The grin on the student becomes a grimace, and he goes back where he was and goes back to work. After a few minutes, (this student is fast and purposeful) the student again takes his work to the teacher Now both student and teacher grin and the teacher speaks. You're kidding of course. You didn't really want to show me this? What did I ask you when I looked at it before? The student remembers it was "What do you think?" The grim look returns. The teacher says, "I suppose you"ll need another day, but why don't you start all over again, and this time try to think about the assignment while you work."

That was the end of act one. Here is act two. Next day. The grim student did start all over. Now he looks exhausted and slightly truculent. He carries his work over to the teacher again. As the student fidgets, the teacher studies the student's work. Then the teacher asks, "Where do you think you show your best work? The student points, his face tense. The teacher says, "Yeah. You're beginning to get ahold of an idea there. Do you know what you did?" The student looks less grim. "I think so." He gestures, trying to explain, trying to remember. The teacher asks, "Do you think you could carry that idea through the whole piece if you worked the way you did right there?" The student takes his work. Maybe he will try to carry his best through the entire effort by beginning a third time. He might feel, though, this piece is just not it. If he does, he puts his signature at the bottom and sets it up for all to see. It's not the painting he wanted, but there it is. Look it over anyone. It has something in it anyway.

Can you stand one more short scene? A student addressing the classroom finishes, walks to his desk self-assured and sits down. Another student's hand goes up. He gets the nod from the self-assured student and says, "I'm sorry, but to me your introduction sounded phony. And I had a hard time believing you were really sincere, because I kept thinking of that introduction." (Notice how first it was your introduction, but the next time it was objectified? He didn't even have to think before changing it.) The formerly self-assured student looks less so, and he seems to lack a reply, so the teacher, who sits among the students, speaks. "You only gave us your opinion, Bill. Why do you think the introduction sounded phony?" "I guess it was the beginning. That 'Have you ever wanted very much to' bit. Like a commercial, only more put on." The teacher now speaks to the student whose introduction has been condemned. "How else could you have put that introduction? At the beginning." Rhetoric? Hasn't it always been in the speech class?

Now perhaps it is unfair to compare a typical English class with a good art class and a good speech class, but that's what I did. Maybe the act of writing is so complex a procedure it must occur in privacy. Maybe the essay is so structurally complex that it must be examined and analyzed before it can be appraised. But is what we expect regularly from students in English composition so different from what is expected regularly from students of art or of speech? Is the work supposed to be so much more than practice? Is a painting treated with less respect when although unsatisfactory, it is put up for all to see? Is a speech student's dignity damaged because his fellow students as well as a teacher criticises what he tried to do?

If the English teacher acted more like art and speech teachers, unbent, mingled with students during their practice efforts, even tried his hand at writing for all the students to come and see, would he lose the students' respect? If student writing in secondary schools were sometimes revealed while it is in process, by students writing on the chalk board or on overhead transparencies, as it frequently is revealed in elementary schools, would the student doing the writing feel more or less self-assured?

Can the writing process, while it is being learned, be freed of some of the weight of dignity and privacy and mystery and coldness that marks its absence of dialogue? If a little more dialogue, between teachers and teachers, between teachers and students, between students and students were introduced into the composition classroom, would rhetoric lose its meaning, or would rhetoric better obtain its meaning? If we work together as we practice what we strive to make, might we finally make something better when ultimately we have to write alone?

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Summary of Second Conference: Advanced Composition

February 17 and 18, 1967

Although the members of the Conference were by no means unanimous in their views, there were four matters on which they were in general agreement:

1. Teachers of courses in advanced composition share a number of concerns with teachers of advanced college-level work in the theory and practice of public address. It is therefore desirable that teachers of advanced composition and teachers of advanced public address establish--and maintain--contact with each other. Some members of the Conference reported that, at their colleges, such contact already exists; others indicated their intention of establishing it shortly.
2. The primary purpose of a course in advanced composition should be to help students enrolled in such a course to become themselves better writers. Since, however, many--sometimes most--of the students in such a course will soon be teaching composition at the secondary level, the teacher of advanced composition should do whatever his time, imagination, and training allow to make his course serve the needs of such students.
3. Somewhere in the composition sequence required of prospective secondary teachers of English there should be instruction in the history and theory of rhetoric. Most--though not all--members of the Conference were inclined to believe that such instruction should be given in the advanced (rather than the freshman-level) composition course.
4. Though at present we know little about the nature of the writing process, it is highly important that we teach those things which we do know about it, that we attempt to discover other things about it, and that we teach those things when we shall have discovered them.

There were also questions which, though much discussed, were not resolved:

1. Just what is the teacher who is organizing a course in advanced expository writing to understand by the term "expository"? Though the Conference understood that the State Department of Education interprets the term to include what are usually called "persuasion" and "description," some persons felt that the definition--or, if not the definition, then the advanced composition course--should be expanded to include narration and, perhaps, what is called "creative writing".
2. To what extent and in what sense should the advanced composition course taken by future secondary teachers of English be a "methods course"?

Though again the Conference understood the State Department of Education's position--namely, that the advanced composition course should not be, directly, a "methods course"--there were several who felt strongly that "methods" deserve a great deal of attention in such a course and others who held that there should be at least two courses in the advanced composition sequence for prospective secondary teachers of English: one that concentrates on improvement of the student's writing and one that concentrates on teaching the student how to teach writing.

3. Who should teach the course in advanced composition? The views were expressed that those teaching advanced composition (1) should be persons with training that has familiarized them with secondary English education and (2) should come from the upper ranks--professor and associate professor--of the department offering the course.

4. What sorts of things, besides instruction in the history and theory of rhetoric, should go on in an advanced composition course in which the emphasis is on improving the student's expository writing? Most of the answers to this question (three that were frequently heard were that each student should write a great deal, students should evaluate each other's work, and there should be a good deal of stylistic analysis of both classical and work-a-day prose) were answers that were evidently acceptable to most members of the Conference; however, two of the answers--students should receive instruction and practice in writing research papers; students should write on "literary subjects"--were by no means generally acceptable.

Ned Edgington, General Recorder

The Conference on the English Language

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Third Conference: The English Language

March 10-11, 1967

Curtis Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

List of Registered Participants

Keynote Speaker

Albert H. Marckwardt, Professor of English and Linguistics, Princeton University, and President of the National Council of Teachers of English

Minnesota College Representatives

Augsburg College	K. Berner Dahlen
Bemidji State College	Henry Dyck
Bethel College	Max James
Carleton College	Vern Bailey
College of St. Benedict	Angeline Dufner
College of St. Catherine	Sr. Jeremy
College of St. Scholastica	Sr. Macaria Neuseendorfer
College of St. Teresa	Richard Gappa
College of St. Thomas	James Colwell
Concordia College	Ralph Hoppe
Gustavus Adolphus College	Elmer Suderman
Hamline University	George Vane
Macalester College	William Hunter
Mankato State College	John Foster
Moorhead State College	Robert Ponder
St. Cloud State College	T. H. Hansen
St. John's University	Sr. Patricia
St. Mary's College	W. C. Verbrick
St. Olaf College	Richard Peterson
University of Minnesota	
Duluth	Donald Larmouth
Minneapolis	Jon Erickson
Morris	W. D. Spring
Winona State College	Harold Guthrie

Minnesota High School Representatives

Mrs. Jean Olson, Jefferson High School, Minneapolis
Myron Bietz, John Marshall High School, Rochester
Donald Engberg, Detroit Lakes High School, Detroit Lakes

Language Arts Advisory Committee Representatives

Graham S. Frear, St. Olaf College
Sr. M. André Marthaler, O. S. B., Language Arts Co-ordinator for the St. Cloud Diocese, Cathedral High School, St. Cloud

State Department of Education Representatives

F. E. Heinemann, Director of the Teacher Personnel Section
Gerald L. Kincaid, Consultant in Language Arts
E. Raymond Peterson, Assistant Commissioner of Education, Division of Instruction

Observers from Other States

Iowa	Mildred Middleton, Language Arts Co-ordinator, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
	Norman Stageberg, Department of English, Iowa State College, Cedar Falls, Iowa
North Dakota	Mrs. Genevieve Buresh, Language Arts Consultant, State Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck, N. D.
	John Hove, Chairman, Department of English, North Dakota State University, Fargo, N. D.
South Dakota	E. C. Ehrensperger, Department of English, Yankton College, Yankton, S. D.
	Anne Kleinsasser, Washington High School, Sioux Falls, S. D.
Wisconsin	Chester Pingry, Madison, Wisconsin
	John Searles, College of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory Representatives

Ronald Brandt
John Marwell
John Prasch

Luncheon Guest

John Clark, Chairman, Department of English, University of Minnesota

Final Moderator

Rodger Kemp, Head of the English Department, University High School, University of Minnesota

General Recorder

Jon Erickson

Discussion Group Leaders	Discussion Group Recorders
A - John Foster	William Hunter
B - Norman Stageberg	Sr. Jeremy
C - John Hove	William D. Spring

The Place of English Language Study in the Curriculum

Albert H. Marckwardt

As we think about the school program or the place of any subject in it, we are all too prone to become slaves of the past, with our vision narrowed and our actions fettered by tradition. The most significant progress in education has taken place on the rare occasions when one person or another has assessed the demands of his time and looked at the essential facts of his culture boldly and realistically. It was true of Socrates, of the Oxford Reformers in Renaissance England, of Rousseau--and coming down to the modern era, of Horace Mann and John Dewey. The specific reforms and practices they proposed may at times have failed of their purposes, in part at least, but the impact of a powerful intellect was there. Unfortunately there are always others, strong in voice and great in influence, who are reluctant to take leave of the preceding century, or even the one before that.

At the present moment we are at a point in the development of our schools where clear thinking and firm resolution are urgently needed, particularly with respect to instruction in the native language and literature. Problems abound; important issues are unresolved. We find it difficult to define the nature of the language competence we should like to impart to our students. We are uncertain of the procedures which will transmit this competence effectively under the unfavorable teaching situation which characterizes our operations. In fact we are almost at a loss as to how to evaluate what we have taught. The time is ripe, therefore, for a fresh view of the function of language in our society and the responsibility of the schools with respect to it.

Language has long been thought of as the basic mechanism for social cooperation. Without communication even two people would find it impossible to perform the simplest task together, had they once decided to work toward a common purpose or a single end. Extend this to ten, to a hundred, to thousands, and magnify the single end to a whole complex of common aims, and the importence of language in our present society begins to take on a semblance of its real nature.

Of all of the types of human society, a democracy demands intellectual cooperation of the highest order, a cooperation which cannot be achieved without communication operating at its maximum effectiveness. This is true primarily because language is an important tool in arriving at decisions as well as in communicating them. In the making of decisions language must be used responsibly. Ideas must be clarified, issues resolved, and plans formulated in the crucible of public debate. A democracy is no place for the huckster, be he politically or commercially inspired, and a public ever alert to his irresponsible and dishonest use of language must be trained to find him out. A democracy cannot afford the fuzzy thinker, and language is the tool whereby his intellectual inadequacies may be revealed. So much for the place of language in our contemporary society. Its role is greater than it has ever been and continues to grow year by year.

It is the function of all educational systems to preserve the social order of which they are a part, and indeed to improve it whenever possible. The English public schools--private in our terminology--served the England of Victoria admirably. The state system of Prussian education met the needs of an emergent Germany in an era when scientific knowledge was just beginning its amazing course of development. Even the Arab schoolboy reciting the Koran is part of a system that was designed to meet a particular set of needs at a particular time in a specific culture.

Our social order is a democracy, or at least it tries to function as one. Most of us prefer it to other types of social organization, and understandably so. It follows, therefore, that we should like to preserve it. Some of us, moreover, would like to correct certain defects in it and to improve the way in which it functions. Both the preservation and the improvement demand a highly literate and articulate public, and these qualities must be fostered in our schools. Given the nature of our life today, they are not likely to be developed elsewhere. Thus, the challenge of a heightened language competence broadly achieved falls squarely upon our educational system.

Pupils must be enabled to listen and to read with full comprehension. Their listening and their reading must be analytical and critical where the occasion demands. They must be able to get the message, to place it in context, and to evaluate it in order that channels of communication will be open to the widest possible degree. Listening and reading are the receptive skills of language. Writing and speaking are the productive language activities, and the successful functioning of a democracy depends equally upon a wide command of the skills of logical, cogent, and forceful expression.

We must remember as well that we are educating for the future and not just for today. The students in our schools in the closing years of the 1960's will be the responsible leaders of this country in the last decade of this century and the first decade of the next. Accordingly we must, if it is at all possible, attempt to anticipate the language demands that the twenty-first century will make upon those who will be a part of the English-speaking culture at that time. Prophecy is always a risky venture, but it should be possible to get some idea of the nature of these demands by projecting into the future certain of the current intellectual and social trends.

Population increase comes to mind almost immediately. The most recent figures which are available assume a total of some 400,000,000 inhabitants for this country by the year 2000. If the other English-speaking countries undergo a proportionate increase, we may well have about three-quarters of a billion native speakers of English the worldd over. It is almost impossible to predict the extent of the diffusion of English as a second or foreign language, but barring some unforeseen political upheaval in the world, the position of English as a world language will be even stronger than it is today.

To return to the national scene for a moment, it is evident that the increase in population will carry with it an increase in complexity in our social order and in the problems it is destined to face. In terms of our underlying assumption about the function of language in society, this will create a demand that information be exchanged more rapidly, more completely, and more effectively than it is at present. This does not mean the dissemination of spot news or trivia; it does mean important information responsibly and fully conveyed. There will have to be better distribution and better absorption--more effective output and more efficient intake. At the present time there is nothing seriously wrong with the mechanics of communication. We can speak with Alaska or Hawaii at a moment's notice. The question is rather what have we to say, and how well do we say it.

To put the matter in slightly different terms, the increased complexity of our society will place a heavy burden upon all of us for the formulation of ideas and their keen analysis. Our social responsibility will increase in geometric proportion to our added numbers. For this very reason we shall not be able to afford to breed a school generation that will be indifferent to it, or worse yet, one which will consist in the main of lazy and mindless dupes.

Moreover, we shall need to develop a greater sensitivity to and a greater expertise in foreign languages as well. The day has passed when we can consider the place of language in the curriculum from a strictly national and monolingual point of view. It is not only our national life which daily becomes more complex, more tension-ridden, more beset with difficult problems. This applies equally to the world situation and to our relationships with the rest of the world. Thus, the language barrier adds a further complicating factor. The difficulties of communication within a single language are compounded many times over when we must arrive at a common understanding through the use of two or more languages.

We may as well recognize that a single world language is not likely to be accepted or established in the foreseeable future. The experiments over the past seventy-five years with artificial languages have not been encouraging. The current international situation appears to favor an extensive future development for at least three or four existing languages as auxiliary or second languages. But we shall have to learn many others if we really want to understand and make ourselves understood over the vast expanse of the earth.

What, then, are the schools to do in order to meet this kind of situation. How do we go about preparing large numbers of students to acquire one or another foreign language when the occasion demands. The starting point, clearly, is an understanding of language itself, or its structure and operation. Here we can begin only in terms of the language the pupil already knows and uses--English. The recognition that every language has its system, that the system can be described in understandable terms, combined with the realization that somehow every child is capable of learning his own language, and does learn it, will go far toward overcoming the glottophobia so firmly embedded in our national consciousness.

It is equally certain that in the coming decades there will be a vast increase in the amount of leisure time available to the individual. The concept of a thirty-five hour working week is now so common that it no longer surprises us particularly when we hear about it. It is only when the figure is reduced to thirty or twenty-five that we begin to register shock and wonder what people will do to fill up the remaining eighty-seven waking hours in a seven-day span. Our traditional statements of educational aims have always piously included as an important goal the phrase, "worthy use of leisure time," but we have really done very little about it. It is high time that we take it seriously. Certainly as a society we cannot even think of running the risk of filling up the increased time at our disposal with the vapid, the thrill for the sake of the thrill, the purely physical excitation. Basket-weaving, B-grade movies on the late-late show, and beer can scarcely be expected to occupy the hours with lasting satisfaction. If history teaches us anything, this would amount to the first stage of our decline and fall.

We shall need here an engagement with reality rather than a shoddy insulation from it, an engagement which for many will come through contact with works of art, literary as well as other kinds. Considered in mass terms, this means an enlargement of the literary audience. For us, it means an intelligent and effective teaching of it in the schools, more effective than we have been thus far.

Nor can we limit ourselves to literature in its traditional forms. We must transfer the standards of excellence we demand and are accustomed to in the drama, in the novel, and in poetry to the newer forms of expression, the livelier arts, the mass media, or whatever we may choose to call them. If, in connection with these media, we develop a mature criticism, a public taste, and a vocal public, standards of excellence will develop and emerge. We shall get better vehicles, grudgingly of course, but we shall get them. This, too, will require a greater sensitivity to language than we have succeeded in developing today in the vast majority of our students, and sadly enough, in many of our teachers.

With an increase in the number of speakers of English in this country, mounting possibly to four hundred million, the question of what will constitute a standard form of the language will become more complex than ever. We can only hope that by the year 2000 we may have recovered from some of the guilt feelings about the language we use, from our sense of personal inadequacy and incompetence. We must strive for a sense of linguistic security, of comfort in moving about within a sphere of well-bred ease. If we are to achieve this, there will have to be a greater latitude as to what is acceptable and an elimination of the nice-Nelly prissiness that is all too widespread today, both within the schools and outside. At the same time, there will have to be greater precision in the use of language and less patience with language that is vague and turgid. An informed and intelligent public taste cannot be developed from a negative Emily Post prescriptivism any more than it can from an uninformed and indifferent latitudinarianism.

The demands which have been posed thus far call for many and wide-reaching changes. How are we to bring them about? First of all, we shall have to continue to work at improving our analysis and descriptions of the language, in the interests of greater accuracy and a better understanding of how it works. We shall also have to develop the ability to communicate these findings to the teacher in the classroom. Second, we shall have to discover more about the language-learning process, not merely as it applies to the child in the crib and in the kindergarten but during the adolescent years as well. Finally, we shall have to devise instructional materials which will take maximum advantage of the new concepts of language and the latest discoveries with respect to language learning.

One potentially useful model for the revamped presentation of English language is provided by Edward T. Hall. In his challenging book, The Silent Language, he discusses the ways in which patterns of cultural behavior are transmitted from one generation to another, namely through informal, formal, and technical learning. Those forms of behavior which are acquired through sheer imitation of either elders or peers are considered to be the result of informal learning. Whole clusters of related activities are learned at a time, in many cases without the awareness that they are being learned at all, or that there are patterns or rules governing them. All of us begin our language in this fashion.

Formal learning consists of what is taught by precept and admonition. The adult mentor molds the young according to patterns he himself has never questioned. The burden of such teaching is that no other behavior is conceivably acceptable. In it, purposeful drill and repetition play an important part. Many American children learn to master the irregular verb forms through formal learning--at any rate those who hail from environments where such items are not in habitual use. Ring Lardner's engaging character who regularly said, "Whom are you?" because he had attended night school is a striking example, but by no means the only one, of misdirected formal learning.

When the attempt to establish changed behavior is systematically placed in an intellectual context, the learning is technical. The foreign-language student who selects grammatical forms on the basis of paradigms and rules of syntax he has mastered is engaging in technical learning. The English-speaking child who avoids multiple negation because he has been taught that two negatives make a positive and are therefore incorrect is employing technical learning, even though the particular rationalization is sheer nonsense.

It is a reasonable assumption that each of these types has its place and function in the native-language-learning process, that each is effective under certain circumstances and futile in others. It is clearly desirable, therefore, to review the entire language-learning process of the American child, both in his home and his school environment in terms of these three kinds of learning activities. Nor should we expect to arrive at the same answer or set of answers equally applicable to all classrooms, for socio-economic and cultural factors will make for conspicuous variation.

To conclude, it must be emphasized again that language is central to the human experience. The more human--which is to say humane--we are to become in the years ahead, the larger the central linguistic core will loom. This demands constant engagement with language in the curricula we plan. The more this engagement is centered on the pupil the better; the more varied the linguistic experience, the better.

From time to time in the history of western culture, language has been central in the educative process. It was true of the medieval university, where the trivium, the curriculum for the baccalaureate, consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric. It was true as well of the grammar school of the Renaissance. Admittedly, there is more to teach today, and much more which needs to be known, and consequently language often tends to be compressed or squeezed out of the program of studies. But even so, most of what needs to be learned must be learned through the medium of language. It is all the more urgent, therefore, that firm and effective language-teaching procedures be established. This end will be realized only when teachers know what language is, what it is not, and what it can be made to do.

The English Language in the High School Program

Jean Olson

New curriculum developments and new language textbooks and materials are demanding that the secondary school English teacher not only speak English, but also understand what language is and why language is important. In working with English teachers, both first year and "experienced," in in-service meetings, preparation periods, or via a frantic note asking whether "yesterday" is a noun or an adverb, I've heard the repeated plea, "I don't know what I'm doing." On behalf of myself and other teachers who feel a responsibility to teach language, let me attempt to convey to you the breadth of our responsibility and, unfortunately, of our ignorance.

A Language Arts Curriculum Guide says it is "language centered." "Fine," says the college graduate. "Literature is language at its finest." But then the teacher discovers that by language the guide means more than literature, or even grammar. We are expected to teach students about the nature of language. What is language? A gift from God? The invention of English professors? How is language learned? How did language begin? What it the relationship between language and culture? Can it be true that the language we learn might determine the way in which we construct reality? How is language used to persuade? These are the questions which we ask students, and the questions which they ask us.

An understanding of language is not something one must gain after years of studying literature and composition. An understanding of the nature of language should form the basis of all work in language--grammar, literature, or composition. This understanding can be gained in various ways. Much is informal--sensed, not taught. In the classroom it can be formal or technical; we can lead students to make generalizations about language for themselves. I think that the social and psychological significance of language is the most important and the most neglected area of language study. This area is rarely covered in textbooks, and unless the teacher has had access to information about language or has been led to see its importance as a humanizing force, he is unable to lead students to an understanding of language. I would hope a course in the nature of language will become an important part of the training given teachers.

In addition to teaching general concepts about the nature of language, we are expected to teach students a "standard" dialect. How can we do this if we don't realize that variations--social, regional, and functional--exist? When a student says, "I ain't gonna do it," how should the teacher respond? Granted this is a matter of methodology, but the teacher's approach must be grounded in a sound linguistic background. Colleges should prepare teachers to accept the concept of an additive rather than a replacement dialect. College teachers should be aware that most of the present language textbooks make proclamations about usage which are not consistent with current linguistic findings.

We are expected to teach general principles of language change. Present English curriculums mention Old English not only when *Beowulf* is taught as literature, but in junior high school when students study the ways in which words enter our lexicon. "History of English" to the secondary teacher is more than studying the Great Vowel Shift and being able to recite the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales* in Middle English. We are expected to teach general concepts involved in linguistic change. A course in the history of English should not stop with Shakespeare, but should show ways in which the principles of linguistic change are operating in Modern English.

Textbooks are beginning to deal with the nature of language, the history of English, and United States dialects. Even the more traditionally oriented books mention levels of usage and semantics. Often, though, the teacher must improvise his own materials. Recent Minnesota Project English units deal primarily in the area of the nature and development new grammars, and of informing prospective teachers that these are the grammars which are now taught in secondary schools.

An interesting thing happens in English classrooms. Teachers commonly spend weeks on nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, and then collapse in despair before ever reaching the meatier aspects of grammar. For example, subordination commonly receives less attention than nouns. It seems to me that the emphasis in grammar should be on the larger, syntactic structures rather than on individual words, especially if we hope for a carry-over into composition. Surely college courses can help in placing a more realistic perspective on the teaching of grammar.

Many publishers of grammar textbooks are no longer wary of structural and transformational grammar. One well-known series now introduces grammar study in the elementary grades, and includes a study of the sound system, historical development, and the study of syntactic elements. The more conservative, traditionallly oriented, texts now include boxed sections entitled "structural clues," or an appendix devoted to structural grammar. The transition from a textbook version of traditional grammar toward a structural or transformational grammar is not going to be a sudden one. There will continue to be teachers and schools who cling to the familiar traditional grammar. A background in structural and transformational grammar will help the teacher in such a school in several ways. First, he can teach traditional grammar with new insights, perhaps adding structural clues, or asking "How can we combine, or transform, these two sentences?" Certainly his approach to grammar will be more analytical, his lessons laced with apt examples. Then, too, with a background in linguistics, teachers can press for curriculum change and choose new texts more intelligently.

So far I've outlined a portion of what is expected of secondary school English teachers in the area of language. Notice that what I've urged--nature of language, the development and structure of language--is all included in one basic requirement. I don't see how you can do it in one course. Some might teach a course in history, and tack on a lecture in dialects. Another may teach a course in grammar, and mention history. Surely we need some courage in pushing for several courses. I think that English majors would fill such courses as electives. It is courses such as these that teachers wish they had had.

In conclusion, let me review what I feel we should expect from you, our college teachers. First, remember that you're teaching teachers. What we learn from you in 1967, we teach in 1968. I don't think you can leave all reference to pedagogy to the methods teacher; too often the methods teacher may not have had linguistic training. I don't mean you should convert your structural grammar course into "how to teach grammar to kids who couldn't care less." But selected readings in applied linguistics would seem pertinent to the content of your course. A discussion of the applications of grammar study to rhetoric and literature may open new avenues of study for the English scholar and prospective teacher.

I think most important of all, prepare teachers to teach by convincing them that your subject matter--linguistics--is important, indeed the focal point of much English curriculum study. The English major graduates as an "expert" in literature, and convinced that literature is English. You must help to change this attitude. Often it's your attitude toward language which a student adopts. Hopefully this attitude is one which takes an analytical, objective look at language, and one which is convinced of the importance of language in the curriculum.

Keep aware of curriculum and textbook developments. Let your students know that they will be expected to teach concepts about language. We are expected to teach language. Teach us, so that we can teach our students.

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Summary of Third Conference: The English Language

March 10 and 11, 1967

The major topics of discussion on the first day of the conference were three:

1. Present course offerings in English language: it was determined that most, if not all, of the colleges and universities represented currently offer at least one course for the prospective secondary-school teacher which has to do with grammar, phonetics, and language history. A few schools offer--and often require--additional language-oriented courses. There is, however, considerable variation both in the number of hours in English language required by the various institutions and in the specific content of the individual courses.

2. Proposed content of courses in English language: it was generally agreed that courses in English language should be concept-oriented rather than fact-oriented. It was noted that training in the application of linguistic principles to special instructional problems might be best undertaken in methods courses taught in coordination with linguistics courses. There was also widespread agreement that a course in English language should concern itself with grammar and phonology, semantics, and dialectology, though there was little agreement about the emphasis to be placed on the latter two subjects. With regard to which approaches to grammar should be taught in linguistics courses, participants argued that each of three approaches--traditional, structural, and transformational--offers insights into the structure of English and that it is valuable for the prospective teacher to be familiar with more than a single view.

3. Actual value of courses in English language for prospective secondary-school teachers: it was agreed that it is desirable for the secondary-school teacher to be linguistically sophisticated. Participants argued that linguistic study is valuable in and of itself and that it gives the future teacher insight into the realities of language and into other forms of communication. Not all of what the prospective teacher learns in a course in the English language will be directly applicable to teaching in the secondary schools, but it is important that the teacher's background in language should be greater than that of his students. It was argued that like other aspects of his education, the teacher's training in English language is for the purpose of providing background and orientation rather than for providing specific content for his teaching in the schools.

The major topic of discussion the second morning of the conference was the place of the study of the history of English in the training of the future secondary-school teacher. Participants agreed that familiarity with the history of English as a language is desirable background for the prospective teacher. The teacher must be cognizant of language change and of the structure of earlier systems of English so that he will be able to give his students a sense of perspective with regard to the language they speak and to help them to understand and appreciate non-contemporary English and American literature. The question of whether it is necessary to teach the history of English as a course separate from the course in the structure of English was not resolved. There was some agreement, however, that in the linguistic training of teachers primary emphasis should be upon the structure of the language and that such study should precede work in the history of English.

Because the prospective teacher must be trained in a number of related areas, including the methodology of teaching, there was widespread agreement that there should be coordination of activities in such courses as speech, language, literature, and methods, so as to eliminate gaps in the curriculum and encourage cooperation toward achieving the common goal of preparing future secondary-school teachers.

In the final session, the reports of the group recorders were presented and these were followed by general discussion. Professor A. H. Marckwardt, the keynote speaker, pointed out that the conference had repudiated the notion that the prospective teacher should be taught only what can be transmitted directly to his future pupils, but he noted that the conference had also concentrated unduly on problems of course content. He pointed out that since one cannot hope to survey the whole field of English linguistics, the general college course should be aimed at giving students experience in handling language problems and providing them with acceptable attitudes and approaches to language study.

The first question from the floor reintroduced the problem of what should be the place of semantics in a course in English language. It was noted that much of the concern of the secondary-school teacher is with problems of meaning. Many participants felt that a knowledge of semantics is to be derived from one's general college background, not from some particular course or courses. Others argued that even though this might be so, it would still be desirable if some course could offer the future teacher some unified approach to the problems of meaning. Another participant introduced the question of whether or not the beginning student should be introduced to more than a single approach to phonology. There was little agreement to be found in the ensuing discussion, but Professor Marckwardt suggested that the realization of the differing uses of the various systems is more important than the mastery of the systems themselves. He related this to his earlier remarks on the significance of proper attitudes in language study. One participant argued that it is more important from the point of view of practicality to teach sophistication in syntax than in phonology, He felt that it is necessary to present practical justification for teaching linguistic principles to the general student. Professor Allen, conference director, argued in reply that while an awareness of linguistic principles underlies the sound teaching of such subjects as composition and rhetoric, one should not attempt to justify the teaching of English language on that basis. Rather it must be defended as a humanistic discipline, perhaps the most important in the curriculum considering the place of language in human society. He pointed out that no one working with or in English can do a successful job if he is linguistically naive. The conference closed with the reminder that the participants had come together not to establish hard and fast policy, but rather to exchange ideas and attempt to find ground for agreement.

Jon Erickson, General Recorder

The Conference on Literature

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Fourth Conference: Literature
March 31 - April 1, 1967
Curtis Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

List of Registered Participants

Keynote Speaker

Lawrence V. Ryan, Professor of English, Stanford University

Minnesota College Representatives

Augsburg College	Einar Johnson
Bemidji State College	Philip Sauer
Bethel College	Mary Sodergren
Carleton College	Erling Larson
College of St. Benedict	Sister Paula Reiten
College of St. Catherine	Sister Jeremy
College of St. Scholastica	Mary Grandmaison
College of St. Teresa	Eugenie Colbert
College of St. Thomas	John McKiernan
Concordia College	Raymond A. Nelson
Gustavus Adolphus College	Gerhard Alexis
Hamline University	Richard Moyer
Macalester College	William Hunter
Mankato State College	Robert Wright
Moorhead State College	Clarence Glasrud
St. Cloud State College	Lewis Smith
St. John's University	Brother Louis
St. Mary's College	Brother L. Urban
St. Olaf College	David Wee
University of Minnesota	
Duluth	Wendell P. Glick
Minneapolis	James Scoggins
Morris	James C. Gremmels
Winona State College	Douglas Stenerson

Minnesota High School Representatives

Mrs. Inella Burns, Mankato Senior High School, Mankato
Sister M. André Marthaler, O.S.B., Cathedral High School, St. Cloud

Language Arts Advisory Committee Representatives

Edna C. Downing, Sanford Junior High School, Minneapolis
Agnes McCarthy, Curriculum Director, Senior High School, Faribault
(Other Committee members attending this conference are Clarence Glasrud and Sister André.)

State Department of Education Representatives

F. E. Heinemann, Director of the Teacher Personnel Section
Gerald L. Kincaid, Consultant in Language Arts and Liaison Officer for the Language Arts Advisory Committee

Observers from Other States

Iowa	Wayne DeMouth, Abraham Lincoln High School, Des Moines, Iowa
	Curtis Page, Department of English, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa
North Dakota	Catherine Cater, Department of English, North Dakota State University, Fargo, N. D.
	Sister Mary Bernard, St. Mary's High School, Bismarck, N. D.
South Dakota	Arthur Huseboe, Department of English, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. D.
	Mrs. Marian Pfaff, Washington High School, Sioux Falls, S. D.
Wisconsin	Lee A. Burress, Department of English, Stevens Point State University, Stevens Point, Wisconsin
	Mrs. Gladys Veidemanis, Oshkosh Senior High School, Oshkosh, Wisconsin

Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory Representative

Ronald Brandt

Final Moderator

H. B. Allen, Director of the Conferences

General Recorder

Toni McNaron, Assistant Professor of English, University of Minnesota

Discussion Group Leaders	Discussion Group Recorders
A - Lee A. Burress	Sr. Paula Reiten
B - Clarence Glasrud	Bro. L. Urban
C - John McKiernan	Marian Pfaff

LITERATURE IN THE ENGLISH PROGRAM

Lawrence V. Ryan

It is almost fifteen years now since I last faced an audience in my native state, and I feel rather presumptuous in facing one in Minnesota now. For one thing, I have been away so long that I am out of touch except for occasional chats with old friends at conventions, with what is being done about the English major program in your colleges and universities. For another, I have just committed the ultimate treason for a teacher--as of Monday I shall be moving into the dean's office at Stanford University. And all of you who are teachers know that deans, particularly academic deans, are never in touch with anything real about education. A colleague of mine gave me pause, moreover, when he remarked to me about this new job, "Do you know what the definition of a professor becoming a dean is? It is a mouse turning into a rat."

But mouse or rat, interloper or fellow English teacher, I am here at Professor Allen's request to say something about the problems of devising a suitable major program in our discipline, particularly in literature, for the future teacher of the subject in the schools.

Before we can really think about the collegiate major in English as a preparation for teaching, we must consider what is the ultimate goal of the school program in literature from kindergarten through the twelfth grade.

The ultimate goal, we professors ought to keep reminding ourselves, is not accumulation of facts or anecdotes about literature and its creators, not simply acquaintance with the major figures and literary movements, not even skill in formal literary analysis for its own sake. Each of these plays its due part in the total process of mature literary appreciation, but it is a secondary, an ancillary, rather than a primary part. The ultimate goal is, rather, development of young people's capacities for ongoing engagement with literature as a significant and rewarding human activity. The ideal is to foster in everyone a meaningful relationship to literature, beginning with his first exposure to rhymes and simple stories and increasingly expanding the range of his literary experiences at every stage of his formal schooling and his adult life. Providing him with such opportunities can help him toward understanding himself better as a person, as a member of a human community not completely circumscribed within narrow bounds of time and space, and as the possessor of a continually expanding heritage of literature that can help to shape and give direction to his own esthetic and moral life.

These fundamental aims of literary study are often obscured by other considerations; obscured, unfortunately, from the primary grades right through the graduate departments in the universities. I shall have more to say shortly about the failures of collegiate and university English departments to think very much about this ultimate goal of lifelong engagement with literature at all. But in the schools themselves this goal is sometimes lost sight of under the pressure of meeting the many other demands of the English language program. In the elementary classroom some teachers, faced with increasing encroachments upon their already crowded school day, may find themselves devoting far less time than is desirable to providing encounters with worthwhile literature for the children. Or faced with the task of improving the reading ability of their diversely talented pupils, they may feel that they have no time to teach literature. Yet oral and written materials are one of the most helpful means of stimulating boys and girls to read more extensively, with better comprehension, with greater enthusiasm and deeper commitment. In the secondary schools, discouragement with efforts to find literary works appropriate for students who do not respond to the "greats," that is, to the traditional materials that were presented to us as English majors in college, sometimes leads to substitution of reading matter that is unsatisfactory as literature and hence beneath the dignity of the boys and girls as maturing human beings. Or, conversely, since the majority of high school graduates within the next decade will be making at least a gesture toward furthering their education beyond the twelfth grade, in some classrooms there is too much stress on the kinds of secondary interests of literary study mentioned above, out of a concern to prepare one's students adequately "for college."

And "there's the rub." For much of the trouble comes from the image of what literary study appears to be as derived by teachers from English courses to which they have been exposed in their own major programs in college or the university.

But as Professor Benjamin DeMott of Amherst told the Dartmouth College Conference in English last summer, English has almost lost its substance as a subject worthy of serious concern because it has become enmeshed in techniques and in trivia. And he was talking about the college, as well as the school, classroom.

> English [he argued] is not centrally about the difference between good books and bad. It is not centrally about poetics, metrics, mysteries of versification, or the study of balance and antithesis in the Ciceronian sentence. It is not centrally about the history of literature, not centrally about changes in moral and philosophical systems as deducible from abstracts of selected Great Works. Still more negatives: The English classroom is not primarily the place where students learn of the majesty of Shakespeare

> and alas for Beaumont and Fletcher. It is not primarily the place where students learn the difference between the simile and the metaphor. It is not primarily the place where students learn to talk about the structure of a poem, or about the logic of the octave and sestet, or about the relation between the narrator and author and speaker and mock-speaker and reader and mock-reader of the poem. It is not primarily the place where students learn to mind their proper manners at the spelling table or to expand their vocabulary or to write Correct like nice folks. It is not a finishing school, not a laff riot with a swinging prof, not an archaeological site.

If I may be excused for quoting another speaker's words so extensively, I should like to present you now with Professor DeMott's definition of what the function of the classroom is. The English classroom, he said,

> is the place--there is no other in most schools--the place wherein the chief matters of concern are particulars of humanness--individual human feeling and human response as these can be known through the written expression (at every literary level) of men living and dead, and as they can be discovered by student writers seeking through words to name and compose and grasp their own experience. English in sum is about my distinctness and the distinctness of other human beings. Its function, like that of a good many books called great, is to provide an arena in which the separate man, the single ego, can strive at once to know what if anything he uniquely is, and what a few of his brothers uniquely are. The instruments employed are the imagination and the intellect and any text or event that rouses the former to life. And--to repeat--the goal is not to know dates and authors and how to spell recommend: it is to expand the areas of the human world with which individual man can feel solidarity and coextensiveness.

But even if what has just been said and quoted is true--and I believe it is true--the question remains: how to prepare teachers to realize these primary aims of English in the classroom. After all, people will teach, runs a truism we all encountered in our own educational psychology courses, as they have been taught themselves. Or if they are alert enough to sense the inadequacy of the teaching to which they have been exposed, they frequently do flounder when they seek ways of overcoming their own deficiencies as teachers of literature, or of the language, or of the craft of writing. In the summer of 1963, a teacher enrolled in an institute in which I was instructing at San Francisco State College wrote in her journal for the course a paragraph that jolted me considerably. This young woman, though she was one of the ablest participants in the institute, though she held a bachelor's degree from, and had undertaken graduate study in, one of the most distinguished English departments in the country, lamented that nobody had ever taught her, or even defined for her, what she would have to know in order to be an effective teacher of English:

> I went directly [she wrote] from freshman English to survey courses to graduate seminars, and as I proceeded toward being trained to teach English, every professor assumed that someone else had taught the basics. As a result, I had to learn for myself the basic methods of analyzing literary works, and of discovering what applications of meaning the works may have had to readers in different stages of the human condition. Of course, the scope of my vision, instead of being enlarged through study of literature as a humane discipline, was narrowed.

Now like Chaucer's Wife of Bath, I recognize that to some extent we may discount such personal experience as "noon auctoritee." Yet this plaint added much to my then just-budding awareness that when we in the colleges and universities devise major programs in English, we seldom pay serious attention to--no, let's be honest and say that we never even think about--the needs of our majoring students as prospective teachers. We don't even, I may add, think very much about the needs as teachers of that chosen, smaller group of majoring students who are destined to be professors. Sometimes I think we prefer to have it this way so that we can scoff at departments and schools of education for their efforts to make up for our omissions. It is true that in the graduate schools we are not completely inept at performing what is and ought to remain our primary function: to perpetuate the breed of literary and linguistic scholars. But if we continue to assume responsibility for this function alone, we shall exert, whether we are innocent of intending it or not, an unhealthy influence on teaching literature that will far outweigh the good we do in keeping literary scholarship and criticism alive.

This standoffishness and indifference, of course, may emerge from awareness of how thin are the ranks of productive critics and scholars, and from acknowledgment that the many things to be done by the college or university department labeled "English" require a division of labors and allocations of responsibilities that desperately strain our meager resources of talent. "We are few enough as it is to educate our own successors," is the tacit, if not explicit, defense of the older graduate schools; "let the colleges and the newly founded universities train the schoolteachers." Yet, the absurdity of such a viewpoint is that the colleges and the rising younger universities, especially as the pressure for prestige appointments increases, will hire for their faculties men and women who have learned, more or less, only how to do what professors of English do in the more prominent graduate schools. And unless there is a sudden "ayenbite of inwit--remorse of conscience"--about this pernicious trend, even the institutions to whom responsibility for preparing teachers has been grandly conceded by the Olympians, will prepare teachers badly while they scramble for their share of professors interested primarily in criticism and research. The search for academic excellence, sad to say, in too many instances has become largely reduced to almost indecent bargaining in the market-places of academia for a faculty with a national image of scholarly prestige.

My intention is by no means to knock learning, for serious, honest-to-goodness literary scholarship is also indispensable to any English teacher's education. What I am trying to suggest is this: everywhere, not only in your state, people concerned about English in the schools are beginning to sponsor legislation or make stipulations intended to improve the preparation of teachers in the discipline. But, if the leaders, and those who follow the leaders, are concerned with no other function than educating critics and scholars, we may find ourselves with grand suggestions for reform of the collegiate curriculum, and with nobody around who is willing to teach the teachers of English.

I insert the warning, or the note of gloom, at this point because while I think that most of the recent proposals for reforming the teacher's English major make good sense, the specifications of the proposals may be mere words unless there is a will to carry them out in good faith in collegiate departments of English. The professors of education do not want the whole job left to them, and there is no reason that it should be.

Yet let us consider for a moment just two of the specifications on the page of new regulations for the State of Minnesota. They seem logical enough, and few people with any common sense would disagree with their importance in an English teacher's education. I am referring to items laa and lbb: "Expository writing," and "The nature of language, and the historical development and present structure of English language, especially as used in the United States."

At first glance it may seem simple enough to meet this requirement: after all, everyone needs to know a lot about writing in order to teach it, and every properly educated English teacher ought to be informed about language, and specifically about the character, history, and structure of the English language. Very well, but how many persons on your faculties have ever shown any great interest in teaching advanced expository writing; would want to give up other more attractive courses in which they have special interests in order to teach it; and, for that matter, have ever taken such a course themselves--have ever taken any writing course beyond freshman English? And as for finding faculty members who have had sufficient education in both philology and the newer kinds of courses dealing with linguistic principles, with language as a symbol system, with the new grammars, how many of you have a colleague who is fully enough prepared to teach this complicated and difficult material well? For the fact is that most of the M.A.'s and Ph.D.'s on our collegiate faculties are educated in, and primarily want to do, literary criticism and scholarship.

In my own state of California, the new regulations are going to cause even more staggering difficulties for the colleges and universities. Our legislature a few years ago cavalierly stipulated that not only every teacher earning a secondary credential in English, but also every teacher in the elementary schools--I repeat, every elementary school teacher--have knowledge of the language and competence at an advanced level in expository writing, demonstrated by testing or by passing a course beyond freshman composition.

The persons charged with teacher preparation in our schools are, needless to say skeptical that anything much can be done immediately to fulfill these requirements. Who will pay for devising and evaluating the tests in competence? Who will read them? A professor in one of our largest teacher-training colleges figured out that merely to meet the requirement in expository writing for students seeking teaching credentials in his college alone would add $30,000 per year to the budget of its Department of English. Naturally, there was no appropriation of money in the legislation. And what about already certified teachers? If they are to be held responsible eventually for meeting the same requirements, should this problem of what the military calls "re-treading them" be met by more NDEA institutes? My guess is that it would take more than 1,000 federally financed summer institutes over the next few years to help all currently active secondary school English teachers to meet such requirements. I am afraid to think of how much effort it would take if every elementary school teacher in the country had also to study the language and advanced exposition. It could be done, but with what labor is really something to think about.

But let us return to the problem closest at hand today, literature. I understand, to add to my note of gloom about legislation versus its being implemented in good faith and with honest competence, that only one or two English departments among those represented in this room offer their institution's course in children's literature. In the other colleges and universities the course is offered by the department of education. The same is true where I teach. The presumption seems to be that it is infra dig for serious students of literature to waste valuable pre-or post-baccalaureate time on such kid stuff. Yet the literary heritage properly includes a wealth of literature for every stage of human growth, literature concerned with almost every kind of human experience that can be meaningfully rendered in artistic language. Many books classed as children's literature and literature for adolescents rightfully belong, as do works of acknowledged merit composed for mature audiences, to this continually growing inheritance of acts of man's creative imagination.

Or to take another parish, or at least poor relation--what is the locus of the courses in oral interpretation of literature and in drama as a visual and oral art form? Possibly if the college is small enough, someone in the English department will be asked to teach them. But you and I know that where there is a speech and drama department, no professor of English would be caught in the act of committing oral interpretation in his classroom. Of course, this disdain, or fear of being considered histrionic or time-frittering, is not confined to colleges. A tenth-grade teacher in California told me that he was having great success with a class in what we grandly style compensatory reading, by playing records of, and acting out, usually for, sometimes with, the pupils, scenes from Macbeth. But he also said that he kept one of the boys posted near the classroom door so that no one would catch them in the wasteful acts of listening to records, being read to, or dramatizing the text themselves. Compensatory reading, by golly, means the pupils must learn to read from the printed page or the teaching machine, not by means of another kind of gimmick. It is as if we all agreed that once we have made a stab at teaching elementary school youngsters to read silently on their own, we must be "cheating" if we take class time out to read aloud to them or have them act out a scene from a play or the dialogue of a story.

I stand personally for all the good oral reading and all the dramatic play one can fit into the classroom, and for Ph.D. candidates as well as infants in the kindergarten. This past term a younger colleague of mine, in the advanced course in Shakespeare for English majors, tried a wonderfully successful experiment. He recruited the help of a number of graduate students in play-directing and permitted anyone who wanted to substitute acting a role in some scenes from one of the plays for a term paper. Some more conservative colleagues may be shocked at such unscholarly shenanigans, but I would bet that some of those who had to get inside a role from the plays will become better students of Shakespeare than those who tried out their critical and research talents on paper. My own favorite course for teaching is Chaucer, and I think I like his poetry so much because of the kind of first extended exposure to his work I was given in graduate school. For almost an entire term, the professor did nothing but read aloud to us the text of Troilus and Criseyde. He said little about Chaucer's intellectual milieu, displayed absolutely no critical ingenuity, assigned, but never discussed with us, a corpus of outside reading. He simply read the text with great beauty of enunciation and sensitivity to its nuances of meaning. I suppose that it wasn't legitimately a graduate course, and he may simply have been lazy; but it has made me honor Chaucer "this side idolatry," and perhaps even the far side of the great Shakespeare himself.

But these reflections are getting us ahead of the game, though actually they were prompted by our main business. Let us look now at the new requirements in literature that are the occasion of this particular conference. (Please consult the Statement of Regulations for Certifying Teachers of English item lcc.) Having tried to define what I think the literature program in the schools exists for, I should now like to consider the question: are the course recommendations compatible with the ultimate goals of literary study, not only for children in the schools, but for everyone, no matter how far he pursues his literary interests? The answer is, "Of course, they are." In fact, the entire range of stipulations on this page about English teacher preparation contains very little that one could really find fault with. The regulations are, not surprisingly, very closely parallel to those in the final draft copy (January, 1967) of the English Teacher Preparation Study, begun in 1965 under the auspices of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, the NCTE, and the Modern Language Association of America. They are, furthermore, remarkably similar to recommendations of the NCTE and the Commission on English and to such position papers on the discipline of English as that of our own statewide association in California. They are, finally, much like an English major program that I once considered ideal and spoke about nearly four years ago to a conference on English Education at the University of Michigan.

I say "once considered ideal" because, while it still looks like a good program to me when I read it over, an additional three years spent in trying to help write a Framework in English for the State of California have humbled me a little and made me think more seriously about what is the best possible education for the teacher of English.

At the Ann Arbor conference I argued that a generally acceptable bachelor's program in English might reasonably include the following:

(1) A year's course in the development of the English language, with introduction to recent discoveries about the nature and structure of language.

(2) A truly advanced, not a thinly disguised remedial, course in expository writing beyond freshman English. At the time I argued that the subject matter for writing in such a course should come from our own discipline of literary and linguistic study. Now, not only would I

modify that to admit subject matter of any kind that can get the future teacher really to see the act of writing as the interaction of a writer, his subject, and his audience, but I would perhaps no longer insist that it be exclusively expository writing. Since I believe that pupils in schools, and college students, ought to try to write in a variety of literary forms, why not, for the teacher, advanced work in creative writing, if he prefers it?

(3) Mastery of a foreign language; and a fair start, if possible, on a second foreign language (a Utopian stipulation, I now believe).

(4) Additional studies in the humanities, as much as time permits of world literature, philosophy, and intellectual history.

(5) As requirements in literature: preparation in American and contemporary British literature, and not simply in early twentieth-century writers like Yeats, Frost, O'Neill, Hemingway, when we are already two-thirds of the way to the twenty-first century; specialized courses in Shakespeare and in at least one of the major literary genres; a historical and critical survey of English literature at an advanced, not an elementary, level; at least one seminar on a challenging and carefully circumscribed literary problem.

This literary program resembles that specified in the new regulations, though it does not specify literature for adolescents, or theory and practice of literary criticism. In both proposals, however, there is concern that the college student preparing to teach literature in the schools have at least this much exposure to the various kinds of literary experience that will help him in his future work.

Study of the historical development of both British and American literature are indispensable, but not so that the teacher can go out and give from his or her collegiate lecture notes an eleventh-grade survey of American literature, a twelfth-grade survey of the literature of England. I have become extremely dubious about the value of either of these courses below an advanced collegiate level. There I think that they can be exciting. But a watered-down collegiate survey course, or two such courses, as the traditional literary fare of the last years of high school, have caused, I suspect, more indigestion of literature than they have produced nourishment.

Our state committee on the California English Framework, therefore, is recommending, not that such courses be abandoned entirely, but that the high schools introduce in the eleventh and twelfth grades a variety of one-semester courses in literature, language, and composition from among which the students may take choices according to their own interests. "Aha!" someone may say, "what if a boy or girl then should take nothing but courses in modern poetry, or on the topic of "the tragic view of life," or in American fiction. In the first place, given the varying talents and dispositions and the limited size of the faculty, he probably won't be able to specialize so intensively. Secondly, we are also advocating a common heritage of literary experience through grade ten so that following individual interests will not mean total ignorance of other types of literary material. But even if someone should tend to over-specialize during these two years, what greater harm is done than if he were to be bored out of future reading for pleasure? Adults, after all, even those with cultivated literary tastes, are selective about their reading. If the goal is lifelong engagement with worthwhile literature, is a predilection for great fiction and only a mild interest, if any, in great lyric poetry worse than indifference to literature in any form at all?

I have been so long about this point because it may lead to our further discussion in sub-groups of a couple of concerns that should interest us, if we are to keep our college courses in English scholarly and severely critical and yet be thinking about how they may fit the future needs of our students.

First, since we are obviously going to continue requiring the survey courses, we should be asking ourselves: what, basically, are they for? Do we want to teach literary history, or is our aim to enable college students to read literature from a variety of different periods in order to develop a solidarity with their fellow human-beings across boundaries of both time and space?

Secondly, is historical organization of our departmental courses perhaps one reason we are neglecting other approaches that are closer to the undergraduates' needs as they prepare to become teachers of even younger students than themselves? I think a historical sense is very important for everyone, but in the schools many other things have to be taken care of first. Thus I concur in the stress on interpretation of the various literary genres and on twentieth-century literature, especially if we remember that the literature of the twentieth century did not end with the deaths of Faulkner and T. S. Eliot. A teacher must be sensitive to, and know a great deal about, the similarities and differences of the various literary forms--but not in order to demonstrate his or her skills at analyzing structure, imagery, and symbolism for their own sake. That is a kind of mere formalism which the new critics hatched in their effort to stamp out the older philological and historical orthodoxies.

The reason for understanding how the various genres work is that there comes a point in the schoolboy's or schoolgirl's involvement with literature when he ought to begin understanding the subtle relationships between the ethical values, and the esthetic means employed by the authors, of the literary works with which he is engaged.

Yet teachers need help in discovering these relationships from their own teachers--namely from their college instructors. We professors should always be wary of ourselves when we become so successful at a structural analysis or at symbol-mongering that our students begin to do likewise without even caring to ask what are the lasting values of the author's rendition of a portion of human experience. It is not important merely to analyze the structure and argument of a sonnet by Sir Thomas Wyatt; but it is important to perceive how the subtle changes Wyatt makes in the material that he imitates from Petrarch render several of the poems poignantly meaningful to the modern student who comes upon this antique, yet strangely modern poet from a world that baffles him by the violence and fundamental emptiness of much of its experience of sexual passion.

As for the fillip I have given the requirement of twentieth-century literature in the regulations--that the twentieth century still is going on and did not end with Robert Frost!--we should not forget that Frost's reputation largely rests on poetry that was written a half a century ago. Robert Frost is, technically, not a modern, but a Georgian poet. Yet one fact any high school teacher must face is that boys and girls want desperately to know what worthwhile things are being written now, in their own time. I don't mean that they should be permitted to become slaves of their own time and place in history. No teacher is more pernicious than the one who meets his class where they are today and leaves them in the same place tomorrow. But the teacher had better find out _where_ they are today, acquaint himself with what _really_ contemporary authors are concerned with that also concerns the young, if he is going to interest them in exploring the moral and esthetic world of writers who have faced problems of life similar to their own, and created imaginative works that speak to our contemporaries across the distances of time and space.

I think, too, that we should not be so chauvinistic in English departments as to study British and American literature completely in isolation from the rest of the literary tradition. Nor, I should add, as separated from traditions familiar to the kinds of student we have in class. English majors should be made aware of such things as that Spenser is unintelligible apart from Ariosto, that T.S. Eliot should be read against the background of the _post-symbolistes_ of France. If we are so over-specialized that we can re-create for them Dickensian England or pioneer America as little islands sufficient unto themselves, how can we expect our students to become aware of the contexts in which they must make literature come alive for pupils in the schools. Let me give you one sad example of what I mean. A high school teacher recently showed me a syllabus for a twelfth-grade advanced placement course in world literature he was about to teach. He was quite proud of his syllabus, for it included not only English authors, but such giants of the Continent as Goethe, Dostoievski, and Tolstoi. Since it was an

AP class, the last three names should not be startling, and he was going outside the strictly British and American traditions. But every boy and girl in that advanced placement class was of Mexican origin! I simply asked him why he had not considered including any of the literature of Spain--The Cid, Don Quixote, a play of Lope de Vega--to give his class something from their own ancestral heritage of which they could be proud. Quite different is the work of men like Professor Kai-Yu Hsu of San Francisco State College, who is preparing a new series of translations of Chinese classics for use in the schools of the largest Chinese city outside of the Orient.

Let me end by summarizing a few of the things that I have suggested we might consider if we are to respond to the spirit, and not merely to the letter, of the specifications for literary studies in the new regulations.

(1) We have an obligation in our college English courses to present the traditional literature of our language in its larger context of European and world literature, and to do so with some reference to where our own students are.

(2) We should not ignore the recent in literature through mislabeling as "modern" only that which is now pretty safely classic.

(3) We need not offer the specific course in "oral interpretation of literature" ourselves, though I don't see why anyone else should be doing it in place of professors of English. But if we have any literary sensitivity at all, if we are not personally handicapped by "tin ears" when it comes to the magic of literary language, in every one of our own courses we should be reading aloud--sensitively and well--to our students, and requiring them in turn to do the same. Any literary work deserving of the name is an oral artifact as well as a pattern on a printed page. Our students should have daily exposure--as listeners and reciters--to literature that sounds in and delights the ear.

(4) We should do as much as we can with drama, a form that is particularly effective in winning the young to involvement with literature--emotional, intellectual, and since, as Montaigne once said, "it is a whole human being you are educating," kinesthetic.

(5) Finally, we don't do much as English departments with literary experiences that are helpful to future elementary school teachers. I don't presume to guess how we might begin to do something, but it is a topic worth considerable attention at this conference.

What we must face up to as English professors is the task of teaching our own charges in such a manner that when they go out to teach as they have been taught, they can indeed guide their pupils toward the lifelong engagement with literature that is the rightful heritage of everyone who passes through our schools.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The English instructor in a secondary school literature program is confronted with a task so giant sized that excellence in preparation and evidenced competency in performance are imperative. The high school boy and girl with few exceptions no longer comes to our schools to fill out time. Our drop outs, all too frequently, are our bored students -- students who find school an interruption in their education. Even those who can't read are watching NBC Experiments on television, programs like The Leningrad Program, Town Meeting, Lord of the Flies, I, Leonardo da Vinci. What can these non-readers do with Julius Caesar in our classes? with Macbeth? with Death of a Salesman? I believe you and I must be realistic and make certain that the teacher who comes to an English Class in grade 8, or 11, or 12 knows something about reading, where to get and what to do with reading tests and materials. I am a secondary teacher of English and my class enrollment is not unique. I teach 148 students every day. Scattered throughout my four English IV classes I have 17 students who read on the sixth grade level or lower. Because of my class numbers I cannot teach them individually, but neither should I expect them to read Oedipus, the King or Chaucer. And yet I, like every other teacher of high school boys and girls, have an obligation in justice to teach them, to engage them, to make every assignment and every class hour meaningful.

There are also the average and the above average students. These are today's teens, full of tensions not unlike those expressed by Dylan Thomas: "I perceive in myself the angel, the madman, and the beast." These teens do not need the vicarious excitements of literature to keep going. Unless the literature program is interesting, relevant, and taught by a teacher who can teach engagingly, the students will regard this literature class as boredom's peak. A poem will never be so lovely as a Honda. The high school English teacher must teach literature so that it will make something specific happen to the student because, unless he feels literature is a happening to him, to him as an individual, he is going to ask what do we have to read this stupid stuff for? Today's teen is honest, and blunt; he does not want to be spoon fed; he cares little for guide sheets and reading lists; he doubts the validity and the relevance of the past; Viet Nam constipates his vision of the future and he lives in the immediacy, the urgency of the present. He speaks as John Ciardi says, (in one of his poems) 'in idioms beyond construction and sprays modifiers and moods.'

The high school English teacher cannot tell her class we read "Thanatopsis" because it is part of our literary heritage. Yet this is often one of the objectives an English teacher gives. Let me tell you if one of your graduates, or if I said, "We will read The Scarlet Letter since it is part of our literary heritage," whether it would be a high school in Minneapolis or St. Cloud, in Brooten or in Bloomington, in Long Prairie or in Duluth we would have students who would say what's so important about that? What does that mean? And, I ask you, what does it mean? Do we define it as mastery of content? as historical or literary reputational significance? What is the nature of our heritage? What I am saying is that high school teachers of English must have objectives which are well defined, which will hold up under the Socratic gadflies in every classroom. The high school student, thank God, is deeply curious, and in his bumbling questionings makes his literature teacher lead him to experience, through what literature provides, insights into the human condition, perceive what it is like for men to be alive, and understand how and where man has spoken to man to say important things. (In your work with the preparation of secondary English teachers explode all trite objectives they might give you. Challenge them to defend their objectives.)

I cannot tell you much about the content of the high school English curriculum in Minnesota. Many are dominated by the content and sequence of a textbook prescribed by a committee. Some English Departments, fortunately, are daring to experiment with various Project English materials; some are setting up a program of course variety from which the student can elect on the basis of interest or need. That is, the Department offers nine weeks or a semester of courses in American Short Story, American Novel, American Poetry, World Epics, Modern European Poetry, or Seminars in 20th Century Drama, or Ancient, Medieval, and American myths.

In the next decade the high school English teacher is going to make some meaningful curriculum decisions or leave the profession. And these decisions will affect colleges in at least two ways. The students we will send to you will be more sophisticated in literature. We shall have taught them a different content by a different method. We will have learned a what and a how in NDEA Institutes and in professional conferences and meetings. The great novels of the world, and its drama will have been experienced by students, either by television, the cinema, or legitimate theater. Students will have read Homer because in his epics the teens finds today's men and women (The mini teen age crowd talks about the now taste of Homer.) The aural-oral situation in which Homer wrote requires that I in my high school classroom must recreate Homer's meaning in terms of that situation. My colleagues and I will lead our students to understand the performing situation of the Sophoclean, Shakespearean stage, the Ibsen and Arthur Miller stage and the kinds of reality possible to those stages, how man's involvement in time, space, cause, and belief carry profound implications as to what his works mean and can mean to the 30 x 5 students in the teacher's daily classroom dialogue.

The high school English teacher will teach literature as language -- as stretches of language -- as heavily loaded evocative language, thick with paradoxes, ironies, tensions -- all the output of living men. This you must do in your classrooms as well as the high school English teacher. It is there in your college classrooms where the high school teacher must first experience it. It was Auden who said that a poem is truly a verbal contraption and no teacher or student will understand the poem or the drama unless he knows how that verbal contraption works. The students who have been taught the games men play with language to make their contraption work and have had literature read well to them by their instructors are high school students who are reading Eberhard, Empson, Roethke, R. S. Thomas and Lawrence Ferlinghetti. These watch *Time* for listings of the top ten fiction and non-fiction books. Out of such teaching and reading will come our legitimate expository writing assignments. Characters in books and in plays create problems for themselves by clinging to versions of reality which do not conform to real life and students will write about these. Students are now exploring, from that point of view, Neely in *Valley of the Dolls*, Amanda in *A Glass Menagerie*, and Lara in *Dr. Zhivago*. To see these possibilities in composition -- in significant literature by Albee, Patchen, in Donne and Sinclair Lewis -- is one part of the preparation in literature which your departments must provide for your secondary school candidates.

The second way in which high school curriculum decisions will affect college English departments is that we will have to work much more closely together in a professional relationship. In mathematics and science college and high school staffs work shoulder to shoulder preparing new materials, discussing methods, planning workshops, with the college department taking the leadership role. The leadership is yours. Visit our schools so that you and we can work and plan together. There is so much to be done in an articulate cooperating togetherness -- Robert Creeley says significantly in one of his recent poems: If you never do anything for anyone else you are spared the tragedy of human relationships. It is time now that we cultivate each other's human and professional interaction. Such togetherness can vivify your methods classes, your content classes as well as the literature class in high school. It will help us to understand Hemingway's observation: "we are all apprentices in a craft where no one ever becomes a master alone."

It is time that we take the first step and destroy the stigma of Robert Hutchins' statement: "In the Middle West the high school is the place where the band practices." It is now the time that we work together as professionally responsible persons to teach and to prepare teachers who have a high regard for the person, the potential of the teen, so that the generation of young people now moving into the next century will be civilized, humane, responsible leaders. These, at the turn of the century because of our college and high school English classes should be able to answer the question in R. S. Thomas's new poem:

> We who are men
> how shall we know earth's ecstasy?

I submit that the answer lies in meaningful, engaging, insightful literature classes which have the now-concern for man's existential condition -- extending all the way from The Iliad to The Arrangement or The Valley of the Dolls. And I submit that the high school student in literature classes must feel that these writers speak to him and that, because he, the teen, too, is human, he may dare to challenge, to debate, to defend, to speak back so long as he does it in the manner of literary men, in a civilized, humane, sympathetic manner. To do this and How to do this, I believe, is your task in preparing the English teacher while I try, seriously, to carry it out in my high school literature classes.

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Summary of Fourth Conference: Literature Component

March 31 - April 1, 1967

The primary concern of the Fourth Conference on Literature in the Minnesota Colleges Conferences on English Teacher Preparation was an attempt to gain clear insight into the implications of the new regulations for English teacher preparation. Individual speakers, as well as discussion groups, focused on both broad and specific needs if college training is in any realistic sense to equip young people to enter secondary school English classes.

The first area of concern among college representatives was whether the new requirements implied courses in each stipulated area, i.e., English and American literature, major author, genre, theory and practice of literary criticism, adolescent literature, literature of the twentieth and of one other century. The Conference's understanding, validated by Mr. Heinemann, is that while some areas suggest a course, the concern is rather with adequate training received in whatever manner seems feasible or appropriate for the college. In discussing said training, the following consensus emerged:

1. The areas of English and American literature, major author and genre are already being handled in present curricula. College representatives agreed readily to this, and high school representatives admitted that the problems with new teachers do not lie in these areas.

2. Theory and practice of literary criticism remained an open question. Some felt that such a requirement necessitated a course, but that that course should not be the historical, traditional concept of "theories of literature from Aristotle to the present," but rather a course in which a few major theoretical approaches to literature are applied consistently and vigorously to works from all centuries. This course would then give the prospective teacher a method of coping with literature in a critical way. Others felt that the best place for such training lies within presently offered courses and that it is presented by incorporating a critical approach while teaching poems, novels, plays, etc. The division of feeling in this area was felt by some to reflect the need to clarify one's own critical position before teaching a work and then to make that position absolutely clear to one's students at whatever level one teaches.

3. While most agreed that literature of one century other than the twentieth is being offered currently, there was more discussion over the requirement for training in twentieth century literature. High school representatives feel that one of the large deficiencies in young teachers lies in this area, and some college representatives were ready to agree that the present program for the major so heavily stresses literature prior to the twentieth century that little time remains for even elective courses in twentieth century literature. If one of the logical ways to make literature relevant and immediate for high school students is by teaching them a literature that is the least foreign to them, i.e., literature of their own

period and in their own idiom, then further training in the twentieth century and its literature, both English and American, was felt to be mandatory by both high school and college representatives.

4. The question of training in world literature, not included in the requirements, was felt by many, both at the high school and college level, to be a necessary part of the preparation of teachers. This could be included within general introductory courses or within genre courses in which, for instance, epics of several countries could be studied, thereby incorporating foreign and European literature with American or English works.

5. The question of adolescent literature posed the thorniest problem of the entire conference. The initial disagreement lay over what a course in so-called adolescent literature would be composed of. Some felt the course would simply be a study of works already being read in standard literature courses, since all literature is for all ages. Representatives from the high schools, however, spoke of the growing body of well-written literature geared specifically for adolescents, making the point that often a teacher encounters in class a wide range of reading ability and that unless he or she has been exposed to alternatives, the teacher will not be able to suggest readings to those students that will be consistent with their ability and at the same time enriching in much the same way that so-called standard works are.

The next problem of disagreement was over where, given the need for such a course, that course would be most profitably taught. Suggestions were, naturally, by the English department, by the Education department and, in a few cases, by the Library Science School. Representatives from the high schools presented a strong case for the logical positioning of the course in English departments. Members of English departments in the few state colleges that now handle the course supported this with the obvious fact that people in English are already equipped to teach literature, and therefore to teach adolescent literature would simply be a matter of adapting familiar techniques to a somewhat less familiar body of literature. Representatives from the high schools felt if the course were left to the Education department and taught by someone whose training was not specifically in English, it would be of little help to the preparing teacher. What is needed is a way to make young people feel that literature designed for them, which they can read at their level, is also literature of a valid, lasting nature and that they are to study, read and analyze this literature and gain from it roughly the same things gained from a reading of a more established masterwork.

Many representatives from the colleges and universities, however, felt very strongly that the course, if it were to be a course, fell under the responsibility of the Education School, since the course is essentially a methods course. There was no agreement on this though there seemed to be a general feeling that this one requirement, because of its essential distinctness, may require a separate course. It seems virtually impossible to incorporate the teaching of adolescent literature within a normal college English course in the same way that it is possible to incorporate comments on critical theory in such courses. Two specific comments might be helpful here. Professor Lawrence Ryan, our keynote speaker from Stanford, commented at the end of the Conference that he sensed a kind of disturbance over the creation of a course in adolescent literature and the whole subject of adolescent literature. He saw this as perhaps another manifestation of man's negative response to something about which he is ignorant. In fear over not knowing a growing body of literature some college and university English departments may be assuming a "sub-literary" category for that about which they know almost nothing. The other comment was made by Sister André, when she invited the representatives to the annual meeting of the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English in Rochester in May. Her invitation, though to the whole meeting, was particularly to a Saturday morning Author's Breakfast, at which time, she assured us, guests will win copies--autographed copies--of well-written adolescent literature. Having won a free copy, perhaps representatives from college and university English departments may read that copy and alter, to some extent, their sense of non-responsibility for a category of literature which should be immediately pertinent to someone teaching English courses.

In addition to discussing the specific requirements, the groups were also concerned to define the relation of college English departments to the whole matter of teacher preparation. As at least one group put it, this relationship is a very peculiar one. It is impossible to teach potential new teachers how to teach every work, how to handle every critical situation that is going to arise in their classroom. It therefore behooves the English departments in Minnesota colleges and universities to define the principles, and aims of teaching standard works by revered authors and in this way to equip potential teachers to work out for themselves particular problems surrounding the immediate work that they must teach. Representatives from the high schools with some college and university representatives argued, however, that this is really not enough, that this does not define the full responsibility of college and university English departments. If indeed students in college English classes are not properly prepared, part of the responsibility must fall upon the very teachers who complain of their inferiority. If those teachers assumed an immediate role in the preparation of young teachers, and if those young teachers conveyed not only general feelings for literature, but specific information, techniques and approaches, then the college English class would not be marked by the paucity of literary information that everyone who teaches at that level encounters.

It was generally agreed by the Conference that the responsibility for training potential teachers must be shared by the practice teaching experience, the adolescent literature experience, the standard American and English literature experience and the supervision of the employing school.

Finally, representatives at the Conference were awakened to the urgent need for more opportunities of dialogue between high school and college or university English teachers. This point was stressed both by Professor Ryan and Sister Andre and was supported by virtually every member of each of the groups. Most representatives felt that perhaps the chief value of the Conference at the Curtis was affording an opportunity for conversation, understanding, and hopefully, communication. Everyone who teaches English today faces the serious problem in justifying to young people the reading of short stories, plays, novels, poems, essays. This justification must involve the establishing of relevance to the human condition. It is not enough for either the high school English teacher or the college English teacher to stress this. Both must understand what the other's aims are in these areas, and all must work together if the final concern, the student, is to be committed to literature in any way, either emotionally or intellectually. In this connection Professor Allen acquainted us with his intention to write the Minnesota Council of Teachers of English and ask that a permanent part of the annual meetings be devoted to just such dialogues as at this conference, of high school, college and university English departments. If achieved, the dialogue may not simply have been one two-day conference, but will be renewed annually so that we can ask outselves what we have done to improve our own teaching and our preparation of teachers and find out from high school representatives if the people turned out under these so-called improvements are better able to handle their job of teaching.

Perhaps the final word on the matter is a paraphrase of Professor Ryan's remarks at the closing general meeting. In voicing his responses and reflections on what he had heard for two days, one of his primary comments was his impression that representatives of many colleges and universities were concerned with what overt changes in present curricula the new state requirements were going to require. The question, he felt, was continually asked or implied, "What does this mean we're going to have to do? Are we going to have to change the present major?" Professor Ryan, powerfully vocal on the subject, assured us, if such assurance was necessary, that if English is to remain a vital part of the humanizing of later generations and if at the present time a college or university's major program is not training young people who can teach younger people this vitality and relevance, then indeed we must change the present major.

Toni McNaron, General Recorder

The Conference on Methods

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Fifth Conference: Methods

April 28-29, 1967

Curtis Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

List of Registered Participants

Keynote Speaker

Edmund J. Farrell, College of Education, University of California, Berkeley

Minnesota College Representatives

Augsburg College	Anne Pederson
Bemidji State College	Michael Ford
Bethel College	Chris Weintz
Carleton College	Harriet W. Sheridan
College of St. Benedict	Donald Hoodecheck
College of St. Catherine	Sr. St. Alfred
College of St. Scholastica	Sr. Macaria Neussendorfer
College of St. Teresa	Mrs. Victor Gislason
College of St. Thomas	Joseph B. Connors
Concordia College	Dorothy R. Johnson
Gustavus Adolphus College	George Anderson
Mankato State College	Harold Fitterer
Moorhead State College	Sheila Gullickson
St. Cloud State College	John Rylander
St. John's University	(Donald Hoodecheck)
St. Mary's College	Brother H. Raphael
St. Olaf College	Graham Frear
University of Minnesota	
Duluth	Anna L. Stensland
Minneapolis	Gene Piché
Morris	Dorothy Barber
Winona State College	Magda Talle

Minnesota High School Representatives

Eugene Fox, Northfield High School, Northfield
Jean Olson, Jefferson Junior High School, Minneapolis

Language Arts Advisory Committee Representatives

Gloria Erwin, Stillwater High School, Stillwater
Albert Flemmer, Principal, Deephaven School, Excelsior

State Department of Education Representatives

F. E. Heinemann, Director of the Teacher Personnel Section
Gerald L. Kincaid, Consultant in Language Arts and Liaison Officer for the Language Arts Advisory Committee

Observers from Other States in the UMREL Area

Iowa	Mrs. Georgia Burge, State English Consultant, Des Moines, Iowa
North Dakota	G. C. Leno, Dean of Education, Mayville State College, Mayville, N. D.
	Gordon B. Olson, Dean of Education, Dickinson State College, Dickinson, N. D.
South Dakota	Mrs. Bonnie L. Harens, South Dakota Council of Teachers of English, Marion, S. D.
	Wayne S. Knutson, Chairman, Department of English, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D.
Wisconsin	L. Goodhart, English Department, La Crosse State College, La Crosse, Wisconsin

Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory Representative

Ronald Brandt

Final Moderator

H. B. Allen, Director of the Conferences

General Recorder

Rodger Kemp, Head of the English Department, University High School, University of Minnesota

Discussion Group Leaders	Discussion Group Recorders
A - Harold Fitterer	Anne Pederson
B - Bro. H. Raphael	Sheila Gullickson
C - Joseph B. Connors	Chris Weints

The Methods Course: By Whom? To Whom? For What?

Edmund J. Farrell

There are cultures and sub-cultures within and between departments in any academic community that C. P. Snow speaks not of in his famed Rede Lecture, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*,[1] cultures and sub-cultures in which one often finds more suspicion, ill-will and acrimony than is found between the two great branches of learning, the sciences and the humanities.

For years the recipient and rarely the dispenser of a goodly share of this hostility has been the instructor of methods. Given the unenviable responsibility of mediating between the public schools, the subject-matter departments, and the department of education, he has been servant to many and occasionally scapegoat of all. If his province is methods in the teaching of English, he may be housed in either the department of education or the department of English without being a prestigious member of either: because of his affiliation with the department of English, his colleagues in the department of education are on guard in his presence, rarely splitting an infinitive or dangling a modifier within his earshot; because of his affiliation with the department of education, his colleagues in the English department indulgently refrain from discussing *belle-lettres* in his presence, reserving their *bon mots* for more learned and appreciative audiences. To at least some of them he is a man with a bag of classroom tricks which he is willing to dispense to any teacher of English with the largess of Chaucer's Pardoner dispensing relics and indulgences, and with equal efficacy.

Like all stereotypes, the stereotype of the instructor of methods courses in English has its nucleus of truth. He has not always been what he should be. In some large institutions which prepare scores of teachers of English and which could readily afford a specialist in English Education, he has attempted to teach methods with insufficient knowledge of subject matter, concentrating upon manner at the expense of matter, forgetting in his quasi-exclusive emphasis upon process that one can no more teach teaching than he can write writing. Content remains the *sine qua non*. In such institutions, without a master's degree or its equivalent in English, he has commanded the respect neither of his students who have majored in the subject nor of the members of the English department.

In other institutions, both large and small, he has attempted to teach methods with insufficient knowledge of public education in the United States. Without awareness of the infinite variety of abilities, interests, and values of students in elementary and secondary classrooms, he has failed to prepare his students for what *is*, positing instead not only an educational system in which every youngster is a potential university candidate but one in which every thirteen-year-old in a ghetto school is well on his way to being an English major.

If methods courses in English have been ineptly conceived and taught in some large colleges and universities, the fault has lain with both the departments of education and English, the first of which has traditionally been too disdainful of intellectualism and the second, too disdainful of the very real learning problems provoked by those of limited abilities in a compulsory educational system. If the department of education has often given over the methods course in English to one insufficiently prepared in the subject matter of English, just as frequently the English department in its fervor to keep methods away from "the educationists" has turned the course over to a young Ph.D. who, after a few painfully unrewarding years in the secondary classroom, sought refuge in more cloistered towers. Elevated by unsuccess, he becomes in the department "the expert" on all matters pertaining to education, slowly represses his psychic scars, becomes enamored of his own mythology, and within a few years can be heard pontificating at local, state, and national conferences of teachers of English about the ease of teaching Pound's "Cantos" to delinquents.

Implied in all that I have thus far said is my notion of what the qualifications of a methods instructor in English should be at any institution which recommends credentials to enough students to warrant specialized courses in methods. Allow me to summarize these qualifications and supplement them. He should have at least the equivalent of a Master's Degree in English and should have had course work not only in masterworks of literature but in linguistics, philology, and advanced composition. Additionally, he should have had course work in children's literature or adolescent literature and in the teaching of reading. That he often has not had sufficient training in these two latter areas is glaringly revealed in *Specialized Courses in the Teaching of English*,[2] a report of the investigation by William Evans and Michael Cardone into the content of methods courses and the backgrounds of their instructors. The inherent relationship between the training of the teacher of methods and the strengths and deficiencies of classroom teachers is often dramatic: among the secondary teachers surveyed for the publication of *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*,[3] only ten per cent felt well-prepared to teach reading at the secondary level.

Beyond his course work in English, the methods instructor should be familiar with major investigations in educational psychology and psycholinguistics related to learning and, in particular, to verbal learning; he should have sufficient knowledge of educational sociology to realize the effects of home environment and peer culture upon a student's academic performance; he should keep abreast of curricular innovations and projects, and he should be an exemplary teacher. Without this latter art, no matter what he knows and says, he will be subject to *ad hominem* attacks: "Who is he to teach me when he can't teach worth a damn?" For years student teachers have delighted in sarcastically extending G. B. Shaw's "He who can does; he who can't, teaches" to "He who can neither do nor teach, teaches teachers."

I am not suggesting that the methods teacher need have a charismatic presence which awes his disciples, the fledgling teachers who sit at his feet in pursuit of a model of what they might become. Many styles of teaching are effective, including some quietly modest ones. What I am saying is that the methods instructor need know what he is about, that he should give the same care to planning his class that he expects novice teachers to give to theirs, that he should employ the variety of classroom techniques from Socratic discussion to group discussion that he recommends, that he should show as much interest in his students as human beings as he encourages them to show in their students. Above all, he should be intimately familiar with the kinds of classrooms to which his students are or will be assigned, an intimacy which comes not just from his own teaching experiences in the public schools but one which is frequently renewed through observations in a variety of schools. Ideally, I would want him to supervise closely in their student teaching those to whom he has taught or is teaching methods, to witness and to promote the fusion of word and deed, of performance in a blue book exam and in a classroom. But such supervision is not always possible, particularly if the teacher of methods is not released from other instructional and research responsibilities so as to make possible numerous visits to the classroom. If the supervision isn't close, it may as well not be; too many teachers tell stories about the one visit they received from a university supervisor during their practice teaching, a visit which produced little except cynicism about the meaning of the word supervision.

The complexity of American education can no longer be generalized successfully from what one recalls, or more often romanticizes, from his teaching days at a particular elementary or secondary school. Within a twenty-five mile radius of the University of California at Berkeley can be found schools in which blind children sit with those who have sight, schools in which classes for the foreign-born contain youngsters representing twelve different native languages, schools in which 80 per cent of the youngsters are Negro and dialect problems are severe, schools in which not a Negro is to be found and from which 90 per cent of the graduating seniors go off to college. Even if he cannot supervise student teachers in English, the teacher of methods must continually observe; the intimacy with the classroom that he must have is least of all one that can be obtained through a balmy summer week's devotion to Goodbye, Mr. Chips and Good Morning, Miss Dove, with occasional and uncomfortable furtive peeks into Up the Down Staircase and The Blackboard Jungle.

The importance of both the methods course and the teaching experience of its instructor is recognized in Guideline VI of the penultimate draft of "Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English," formulated by participants in the English Teacher Preparation Study, a cooperative study by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Modern Language Association of America. The first part of Guideline VI reads, "He [the teacher of English at any level] should have supervised teaching or an internship in English guided by a supervisor who was prepared to teach English and who has successfully taught English at the level at which the candidate is planning to do his teaching."[4]

I recognize that a special problem exists in those smaller colleges and universities which prepare insufficient numbers of teachers to justify employing a full-time instructor in the methods and the supervision of the teaching of English. In The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges, Volume V of the NCTE Curriculum Series, the authors of Chapter 6, "Preparation in Professional Education," comment on this problem:

> Obviously, a person who teaches a general methods course cannot be equally conversant with every subject his students may be preparing to teach. Hence, some of his students are not likely to get much of specific value from the course. Ideally, a separate methods course is desirable for each subject in which a college prepares teachers. As a compromise in a small college, similar subjects may be combined: e.g., English with speech, journalism, library science. Even when this compromise is impossible, and a catch-all methods course is unavoidable, the conscientious instructor may enlist the aid of his colleagues in various departments in working out individual and small-group assignments. In addition, he may ask able high school teachers to come in to discuss with the whole class and with interested small groups the teaching of their respective subjects. Budgetary provision should be made for paying such needed consultants.[5]

I would go beyond these suggestions. I would urge that the instructor of a general methods course be sure that prospective teachers of English read some current textbooks on methods of teaching English and that they examine and critically evaluate a variety of textbooks now being used to teach English in elementary or secondary schools. Further, the teacher of general methods should consult organizations like the National Council of Teachers of English for lists of recommended works for a professional library. Such lists have been prepared by NCTE for both elementary and secondary teachers of English. Much has been written and published within the past five years on the need for new definitions for English and new directions in its teaching; no person credentialed to teach English should enter the profession totally unacquainted with these attempts to establish the province of his discipline and the appropriate methods of teaching it.

Assuming that the teacher of methods possesses the attributes and has had the training and the experience I would wish for him, what legitimately should he be able to expect that students in his course know or can do as a consequence of their preparation in the English department? Knowing that his cannot be a course in linguistics, in advanced composition, in fiction, poetry, or drama, though he will undoubtedly examine the pedagogy relevant to each of these subjects and genres, he must have some givens, some assumptions he can make about the educational background of those before him.

That his colleagues in the English department have too often given him short change and their students short shrift is dismally documented in The National Interest and the Teaching of English,[6] a report on the status of the profession published in 1961 by the National Council of Teachers of English. At that time 59 per cent of the colleges preparing high school teachers did not require a course in advanced composition; fewer than 200 out of 1200 colleges required a course in modern English grammar of prospective secondary teachers, and only 6 per cent of the colleges required such a course of prospective elementary teachers. Not more than one third required a course in American or English literature of students preparing to teach in elementary schools, and only a fourth required a course in the history of the English language of students preparing to teach in secondary schools. For that matter, the methods course itself was not a necessary part of the preparation of teachers, the reason I assume for 89.4 per cent of the teachers surveyed for The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English reporting an interest in studying practical methods of teaching English. When one realizes that 49.5 per cent of secondary teachers have not majored in the subject and that in 1960 only 51.5 per cent of colleges preparing secondary teachers required methods in teaching English of students majoring in English, he can account for this high percentage of interest.

For the moment, let us set the statistics aside and assume that the prospective teacher has been reasonably well-prepared in his academic subject, that he has arrived in the methods course ready for the confluence of matter and manner, of process wedded to content. What does he need to learn?

Too much probably for any one course.

For the preceding four years the principal instructional mode the student has observed has likely been the lecture. He will have to learn what other modes are possible and which are most efficacious in particular situations with particular classes: small group discussion, class discussion, panel presentation, oral reports, and dramatization among them. He will need to learn to plan a lesson, from objectives through procedures to evaluation, an exacting task to learn; one is frequently tempted to put means before ends, to entertain rather than to teach. Before he can ask the important questions, "What should they know? What should they be able to do?" he will need to learn much about his students and the materials available to them. He should discover what information is accessible in the school about each youngster, what the significance of that information is, how to diagnose for language abilities and disabilities when insufficient information exists. He will need to learn to relate a given lesson to a larger unit of work, to organize so that his instruction will have unity, emphasis, and coherence, that glorified trinity of a good paragraph. He will need to become acquainted with instructional materials in English--books, films, records, tapes, and film strips appropriate to different age groups with different levels of ability and motivation.

And he will need to find a center for his subject matter, a center that can bring a meaningful relationship to what may have been a picaresque adventure through the English department, from freshman comp to Chaucer via Tennyson and Browning, with station stops at advanced comp and Linguistics 130.

I believe that that center is to be found in language, the singular creation which distinguishes man from beast, and makes of him what a friend of mine calls, with pleasant ambiguity, a "form-chasing animal." *Whenever I consider the miracle that language surely is, invariably* one passage from literature comes to mind--that section near the beginning of Helen Keller's The Story of My Life in which she recounts her feelings about the day upon which she rediscovered her humanity, the day when she first associated word with object:

> We walked down the path to the well-house, attracted by the fragrance of the honeysuckle with which it was covered. Some one was drawing water and my teacher placed my hand under the spout. As the cool stream gushed over my hand she spelled into the other the word water, first slowly, then rapidly. I stood still, my whole attention fixed upon the motions of her fingers. Suddenly a thrill of returning thoughts; and somehow the mystery of language was revealed to me. I knew then that "w--a--t--e--r" meant the wonderful cool something that was flowing over my hand. That living word awakened my soul, gave it light, hope, joy, set it free...
>
> I left the well-house eager to learn. Everything had a name, and each name gave birth to a new thought. As we returned to the house every object which I touched seemed to quiver with life...
>
> I learned a great many new words that day. I do not remember what they all were; but I do know that mother, father, sister, teacher were among them--words that were to make the world blossom for me, "like Aaron's rod, with flowers." It

> would have been difficult to find a happier child than I was as I lay in my crib at the close of that eventful day and lived over the joys it had brought me, and for the first time longed for a new day to come.[7]

And whenever I consider the richness of the artistic uses of language, its power to inform heart as well as mind, I am reminded of the conclusion of David Daiches' essay "The Literary Uses of Language." At the beginning of the essay Daiches asks the reader to consider that a journalist has been asked to stand for a while in a city street and then write up an account of the street and what took place there. The author then proceeds to define journalism and to suggest how art differs from it:

> If...the journalist who described what went on in a particular city street during a given period of time had the literary skill (and the initial combination of feeling for life and feeling for language which alone can make such a skill realizable) to present his observations in such a way that when he wrote of businessmen entering and leaving the bank, children coming home from school, housewives out shopping, loiterers, barking dogs, lumbering buses, or whatever else he cared to note, he was able to convey to the reader something of the tragedy or the comedy of human affairs, wringing some human insight out of these multifarious incidents so that the reader not only sees what he already knew or even admits as authentic what he did not know, but sees simultaneously what he knew and what he never saw before, recognizes the picture in the light of his deepest, half-intuitive knowledge of what man's experience is and can be and at the same time sees it in a new illumination--if he can do this, then he has moved from journalism into art. He has shown that he can make the means of expression comment on what is expressed so as simultaneously to define and expand his subject matter: define it by using words that block off the wrong meanings, which show with complete compulsion what is meant is this rather than that, and expand it by choosing and arranging words and larger units of expression so that they set going the appropriate overtones and suggestions which help to elevate a description of people's behavior to an account of man's fate...
>
> Language can thus be regarded as either a medium of communication or as a medium which can, while communicating, simultaneously expand the significance of the communication. The latter is the literary use of language.[8]

Along the continuum from the most prosaic of discourse to the most artistic and unique can be found the content of English, language in all its multiparous manifestations, as historically classifiable code, as structure, as connotative and denotative meaning, as social arbiter, as vehicle for communication.

Most prospective teachers, including those who have had courses in modern English grammar and the history of the language, know little about lexicography, dialectology, socio-linguistics, and semantics, let alone what purpose this content might serve in an elementary or secondary classroom. Here the instructor of methods frequently finds himself introducing both a body of knowledge as well as suggesting systematic methods of teaching it. In the process, he often must place the study of grammar into perspective: it is not, nor should it be, the all nor end all of youngsters' knowledge of language. Too many who are now dropping out of or graduating from high school enter society at the mercy of the mass media, ready to be mulcted by the persuasive words of advertisers, politicians, and putative "reporters." For these students semantics and logic must not be dismissed in sole preference to grammar, regardless of the system. I would hope that the classroom in English could accommodate spelling, literature, composition, grammar, semantics, logic, and much more besides; but too often in the past it has settled for a stilted preciousness which confused grammar and usage and created both the notion that language is "fixed" rather than viable and that the English teacher is the one who fixed it. "You teach English? Gee, I'd better watch my grammar." I would hate to recall the lonely cocktail parties I've attended once the word got out that I nurtured students in the mother tongue.

Hopefully, I expect that the new textbooks employing transformational grammar, structural grammar, or a blend will put an end to much of the nonsense in our culture about what grammar is and does. Since many of these textbooks are designed for use not only in secondary but elementary school, the instructor of methods has a special responsibility to see that those preparing to teach at either level learn how to use the books intelligently, particularly since the great majority of his students will not have had a course in modern English grammar. Here, the methods instructor should be assisted by the members of the English department knowledgeable about contemporary linguistic scholarship, by classroom teachers who have used some of these new materials, as well as by guidebooks prepared to help teachers to use the textbooks intelligently.

Among the essential bread-and-butter tasks of the instructor of methods in English are such things as teaching his students how to compose a decent composition assignment, one that will provide purpose and audience and stimulus to write; how to help students through the process of composing; how to evaluate a composition so that youngsters, rather than being defeated, will continue to grow in rhetorical power and skill; how to compose a significant sequence of questions, one that will inexorably and inductively lead a class into the pith of a literary selection; and how to relate beforehand that selection to the lives of students so that they want to read or listen, assured that what is to come says something relevant to them. Too, the instructor of methods will have to spend time on the relationship between intensive and extensive reading, on significant research findings concerning the teaching of English, on the present and potential effect of popular media on the lives of students, on how to manage a class and a load of 150 students a day, on the importance of professional conferences and professional organizations for continued in-service training of teachers.

Because of the rapidity with which our society is changing, the instructor of methods must be aware not only of what is but what may be; he must acquaint his students with present curricular innovations like team teaching, non-graded instruction and flexible scheduling, indicating how these innovations affect the organization and teaching of English; additionally, he must anticipate with them what impact a decade or so hence computer-assisted instruction, with viewing and listening carrels, will have upon the teaching of English and the responsibilities of the teacher.

If the course in methods does what it should, prospective teachers will depart from it humbled by what there is to know and to do, aware of how to proceed to sustain their professional growth when the college or university is no longer at hand, confident that they can plan a lesson or a unit of work which will enable them to mediate successfully between their subject matter and their students. In language, with its many dimensions, they will have found the common ground upon which content and student meet.

Since 1960 standards for the preparation of teachers of English have been raised in numerous institutions and states, a movement that I anticipate will continue. Too, the curriculum centers sponsored by Project English, the NDEA Summer Institutes in English, the English Teacher Preparation Study, the Dartmouth Conference and NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged have brought together people from English, English Education and the public schools in cooperative enterprises to improve the profession. I no longer sense toward teachers of methods in English the suspicion and hostility to which I referred at the beginning of my speech, nor do I find the naivete about elementary and secondary teaching that I once found among English scholars. There is God's plenty left to be done to ameliorate the teaching of English in the United States. The instruction of both content and methods is crucial; let us get on with the job.

Notes

[1] C. P. Snow, The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution, the Rede Lecture, 1959 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

[2] William Evans and Michael Cardone, Specialized Courses in the Teaching of English (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964).

[3] Committee of the National Interest, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964).

[4] English Teacher Preparation Study, Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English (unpublished draft, January, 1967).

[5] Alfred Grommon, ed., The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges, Vol. 5 of NCTE Curriculum Series (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), p. 335.

[6] Committee on National Interest, The National Interest and the Teaching of English (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961).

[7] Helen Keller, The Story of My Life (New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 34-35.

[8] David Daiches, "The Literary Uses of Language," Prose and Criticism (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966), p. 614-615.

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Summary of Fifth Conference: The Methods Component

April 28 and 29, 1967

This conference was attended by persons who teach or otherwise have a direct connection with courses in methods of teaching English in secondary schools. As was the case in earlier conferences, the conference was an opportunity for persons with common interests and responsibilities to discuss their contributions to the education of English teachers.

Two provocative speeches opened and served to keynote the conference. In turn, keynoter Edmund Farrell of the University of California and Mrs. Jean Olson of Minneapolis Jefferson Junior High School spoke of how they saw the issues about English methods courses. Following the opening session conference participants met in small groups for a series of three discussions. These discussions were reported to the entire conference in a concluding general session Saturday afternoon. This report is a summary of the written reports of the small group meetings and of the concluding general session.

Areas of Widely-Shared Opinion - Participants agreed that the methods course is a necessary component in the education of teachers of English. More specific areas of shared opinion include these:

1. Purposes of the Course(s)
   - a. To consider questions of why English is or should be taught in secondary school.
   - b. To help students make the transition from the role of college student to the role of high school teacher.
   - c. To provide a setting for considering the implications and applications of subject matter.
   - d. To describe or exemplify models of teaching. All group reports emphasized that several models ought to be provided.
   - e. To encourage students to develop thoughtfully a framework for evaluating new materials and courses of study. For many participants this implies attention to current materials (textbooks, for instance) and courses of study (curriculum bulletins and Project English courses, for instance).
   - f. To encourage professional attitudes and habits.
2. Relationships of Methods to Other Parts of Teacher Education
   - a. Although disagreeing on how best to do the job, participants strongly favor a close relationship between the methods

course and student teaching. At the very least, teachers of the methods course ought to know what kinds of situations student teaching involves. Many but not all participants felt that the methods teacher should also supervise student teaching.

b. If a so-called "general methods course" is taught, the teacher of English methods ought to be fully informed about that course and probably participate in its development.

c. Teachers of methods and teachers of subject matter courses in English ought to have a decent regard for the problems of the other and seek out opportunities for supporting each other.

d. The teacher of methods, especially if he works closely with the student teaching program, has special opportunities for nourishing relationships with secondary school teachers and administrators. Many participants felt strongly about finding and using excellent classroom teachers as supervisors of student teachers and as resource persons for teaching the methods course.

e. One discussion group recommended that some appropriate agency sponsor a series of conferences, perhaps regional, for teachers of methods, secondary school teachers, directors of student teaching, and faculty members of college departments of English.

3. Training and Experience of Teachers of Methods

a. The teacher of methods should have wide training and experience.

b. His experience should include secondary school teaching. Many participants strongly favored an arrangement by which methods teachers could regularly return to the high school classroom. One group specifically recommended that the methods teacher should have this opportunity at least once every five years.

c. The teacher's training should include a wide variety of language, literature, and composition plus supporting areas such as psychology, philosophy of education, and research in teaching English.

4. Need for Continuing Discussions

In addition to the suggestion reported as 2e above, the consensus of the group at the concluding session was that there should be a state-wide organization to serve the special needs and interests of persons in English Education. After the concluding session steps were taken to survey the amount of interest in such an organization.

Areas of Divided Opinion - In nearly all instances divided opinion was the natural result of differing local situations. That is, most disagreements were on matters of procedure, matters necessarily conditioned by context.

1. There was no apparent agreement on the number of courses or hours.
2. There was disagreement on when the course(s) should be taught, especially in relation to student teaching. One group, however, firmly recommended concurrence with student teaching.
3. No agreement was reached on whether the course must be taught by the English department.
4. The relationship of methods to other professional education courses, general methods for instance, remains ambiguous.

Rodger Kemp, General Recorder

The Conference for the Concerned Public

THE CONCERNED PUBLIC

Because of its make-up and purpose the last of the six conferences followed a somewhat different format. This meeting was held to acquaint various civic leaders and representatives of certain organizations with the substance and implications of the new regulations. Each participant received in advance summaries of the preceding conferences and copies of the regulations. Then at the one-day meeting five speakers, each of whom had been on the program at an earlier conference, reported upon that conference and its conclusions. These five reports are not given here, since they, in large part, iterated content appearing in the various talks and summaries.

In the afternoon a panel of five participants presented various personal reactions as part of a general open discussion in which all conference members took part.

In their reactions and in the general discussion the action of the State Board of Education in approving the new regulations was warmly supported. A PTA representative said, "I think that these regulations in a few years will break this vicious circle of the unprepared teaching the unprepared to teach the unprepared."

But, while looking with hope toward the ultimate effect of the regulations upon the next generation of teachers, the participants expressed great concern with the immediate situation. In his report Robert Anderson had remarked that it usually takes about twenty-five years for ideas to get into the secondary schools from the colleges. The group felt that twenty-five years is too long to wait in view of the urgency of the need for better teaching and for better use of the teacher's time.

One focus of concern was the problem of upgrading teachers in terms of both subject-matter and their relationship to their students. Anderson had said, with respect to the latter aspect of the problem, that he was "worried about the rural youngster, who learns to hate English because his teacher doesn't understand his background and doesn't know how to reach him through literature through not understanding the frame of reference he brings to that literature."

That workshops and institutes can be effective for both city and small-town teachers was indicated by several, although a question arose about the kind of incentive required to persuade teachers to attend.

Smaller school districts could effectively cooperate, it was suggested, in holding an institute during the summer, with fees for the outside director and consultants and some stipends for the participating teachers who need some income between June and September. "For a teacher with a family $5,600 is not enough."

Some school districts provide an incentive by establishing intermediate grades on the salary schedule, with upward steps being attained only after inservice work, workshop and institute participation, or summer school study. A difficulty appeared here in that the summer study is often in a field other than that in which a teacher is actually teaching. Some teachers apparently take courses simply to get the credits. The remedy for this difficulty has already been found by some school boards, however, according to Mr. Heinemann, who said that they simply insist that the upward step cannot be attained unless the summer work is in the teaching field. A related difficulty was then pointed out, that some teachers actually assigned to English classes in their high schools do not have enough work in the field to permit them to take graduate courses.

Inservice study should not be additional to the teacher's regular load, one participant maintained. He referred to one system, that of Spring Lake Park, which during the past year had been on a modular program. Members of the staff taught four days a week and spent the fifth day working together in inservice study and preparation. It was pointed out that a similar plan, with four classes a day for four days a week and the fifth day for inservice activity, has already been adopted for 1967-68 for both junior and senior high school teachers in Faribault and for one high school in Duluth.

Extending the inservice English program through the whole range of the curriculum appeared also as desirable. In Marshall, Minnesota, the head of the high school English department has initiated an inservice program which includes teachers in the elementary schools. Consideration of the situation in elementary language arts was not extensive, however, in view of the likelihood that new English preparation regulations for elementary teachers are now under discussion for presentation to the state board of education.

Several participants stressed the importance of strong inservice support from both the local PTA and the local school board. One said that actually inservice programs are needed for both teachers and parents. A PTA representative added that the several conferences have made it very clear that all lay supporters of the schools, as well as parents, need to keep themselves better informed about new developments. "We have no right to criticize adversely," she said, "without getting such information."

Another focus of discussion was the problem of the small schools. The representative of the state school boards association remarked that 55 percent of the high schools in the state are smaller than any of the schools in communities represented in the conference. The small schools are faced with financial problems just as the urban areas are, it was said. "We're all trying to provide the best education we can. We'd like to reduce the teacher-student ratio, too; we'd like to pay salaries. But we're already experiencing a taxpayers' revolt, if we can interpret properly one cause of the defeat of so many school board members in the recent spring elections." A small town school board member added, "We have about exhausted our resources, and they are not enough. We have just raised the rate fifteen mills, and that means an increase of $100 a year on a $20,000 house. Where is the additional money coming from?"

A second trouble area of the small school was described as the need for flexibility in the staff, a need which, it was claimed, will become acute when the new regulations go into effect. The state language arts consultant replied, however, that the difficulty is one created by the local school. He compared two schools with which he was familiar. "In one school not one English teacher is a full-time English teacher prepared to teach English. In the other school, the same size, every English teacher is a full-time English teacher. This is a problem that can be solved by the school administrator. It is purely an administrative affair, and the solution depends upon how much importance the administrator attaches to English. If hiring a football coach takes priority, then the football coach may turn up with an extra English class."

One participant commented upon the difficulty which junior high school administrators will encounter if they have common learnings or core programs in their schools, for the teacher charged with both social studies and English will have to have stronger background in English than is now required. During the discussion another participant summarized the feeling of the group by saying, "People who want a seventh and eighth grade teacher to teach both English and social studies, common learnings, are like the person who wants his medical practitioner to be both a dentist and an M.D. If the teacher is expected to teach in both areas, he must be trained in both areas, and we must be prepared to pay him more accordingly."

A representative of one state organization asked about the means of disseminating the information from the various conferences. It was pointed out that this final conference was set up as an ad hoc meeting without continuity, in the hope that each organization represented will find its own best way to make known to its membership what the new regulations will do for future teachers of English in the state.

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Sixth Conference: The Concerned Public

May 20, 1967

Curtis Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota

List of Registered Participants

Name and Address	Association Represented
Mrs. Alice B. Charbonneau 319 S. E. 8th Street Minneapolis 14, Minnesota	Minnesota Federation of Teachers
R. A. Dolen Director of Secondary Education 653 City Hall St. Paul, Minnesota	St. Paul Public Schools
Mrs. J. K. Eickhof Crookston, Minnesota	Crookston Board of Education
Arthur Elfring Independent School District 281 5214 - 37th Avenue North Robbinsdale, Illinois 55422	Minnesota Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Mrs. L. J. Emmons, President Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs 615 West Park Albert Lea, Minnesota	Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs
F. E. Heinemann Director of the Teacher Personnel Section Centennial Office Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55101	Minnesota Department of Education
James L. Jacobs Director of Special Services P. O. Box 367 St. Peter, Minnesota	Minnesota School Boards Association
Gerald L. Kincaid Consultant in English Language Arts Centennial Office Building St. Paul, Minnesota 55101	Minnesota Department of Education
Mrs. Verna L. Klein Pine River, Minnesota	Pine River Board of Education

Name and Address	Association Represented
Dorothy Lamberton 5101 Sheridan Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota	American Association of University Women
Mrs. Ernest Lorentzen 1038 Rossman Avenue Detroit Lakes, Minnesota 56501	Detroit Lakes Board of Education
Raymond E. Maag Counselor in Parish Education 122 West Franklin Avenue Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404	Minnesota South District of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod
Mrs. Charles McCoy 2312 Lake Place Minneapolis, Minnesota	Minnesota League of Women Voters
William Nigg, President 1120 Carney Avenue Mankato, Minnesota 56001	State Association of Secondary School Administrators
Mrs. Stener Olson De Graff, Minnesota 56233	Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers
Elmer P. Piepgras 421 West Luverne Street Luverne, Minnesota	Luverne Board of Education
Mrs. Ray Ramey Hill City, Minnesota 55748	Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers
Stanley D. Sahlstrom, Director University of Minnesota Technical Institute Crookston, Minnesota 56716	Minnesota Citizens Committee on Public Education
Leigh White Editorial Department Minneapolis Tribune Minneapolis, Minnesota	Minneapolis Tribune

Speakers

Hubert Anderson	Department of English, Hopkins Senior High School, Hopkins, Minnesota
Charles Caruson	Department of English, Hopkins Senior High School, Hopkins, Minnesota
John Foster	Professor of English, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota
Graham S. Frear	Asst. Professor of English, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota
Clarence Glasrud	Chairman, Department of English, Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minnesota

MINNESOTA COLLEGES CONFERENCES ON ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

Sixth Conference: The Concerned Public

May 20, 1967

9:30 a.m.	Registration -- ABC Room
9:45	The Background of the Regulations Harold B. Allen, Department of English, University of Minnesota; Chairman of the Language Arts Advisory Committee and Conference Director
10:15	Coffee Break
10:30	Implications of the Speech requirements Charles Caruson, Department of English, Hopkins Senior High School, Hopkins, Minnesota
10:50	Discussion
11:00	Implications of the language requirements John Foster, Department of English, Mankato State College
11:20	Discussion
11:30	Implications of the composition requirements Hubert Anderson, Department of English, Hopkins Senior High School
11:50	Discussion
12:30 p.m.	LUNCHEON -- Evergreen Room
1:40	Implications of the literature requirements Clarence Glasrud, Chairman of the Department of English, Moorhead State College
2:00	Discussion
2:10	Implications for methods and practice teaching Graham S. Frear, Department of English, St. Olaf College
2:30	Discussion
2:45	Coffee Break
3:00	The role of the public -- a panel reaction R. A. Dolen, St. Paul Public Schools Mrs. Ernest Lorentzen, Detroit Lakes Board of Education James L. Jacobs, Minnesota School Boards Association Mrs. Stener Olson, Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers
3:20	Discussion
4:00	Adjournment